This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

LIBRARIES
079310 8

ZRA

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW.

REV. PROF. JOHN M. LEAVITT, A.M.,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOL. XXII.

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

PHILADELPHIA:
Jas. B. Rodgers Co., Printers, 52 & 54 North Sixth St.
1871.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.:
PRINTED BY JAS. B. RODGERS CO., 52 & 54 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXII.

No. I.

Art.		Page
I.	John Keble, The Poet-Pastor	1
II.	Soteriology	12
III.	Polytheism and Mythology	23
IV.	Matthew Parker	38
V.	Dr. McClintock's Cyclopædia, Methodism and the Church	50
VI.	The Incarnation	61
VII.	Our Domestic Missions	82
VIII.	Bishop Burgess.	96
IX.	Rome and her Council	105
X.	Church Music and the Beautiful	127
Notices of Books		148

Froude's History of England, Vols. I. and II.; The Holy Grail and Other Poems; The Odes and Epodes of Horace; Juventus Mundi; The Origin and Development of Religious Belief; Primal Condition of the Great Pyramid of Egypt, &c., &c., Evenings with the Sacred Poets, Walter Ogilby; Old Horse Gray, and the Parish of Grumbleton; Navigation Francaises et La Revolution Maritime; Maine Historical Collections; Hymns of the Higher Life; Sermons, by Rev. Russell Trevett, D.D.; The Psalter, and Selections of Psalms, pointed for chanting with the daily prayers and litany; The Church Hymnal; Common Praise; The Pursuit of Holiness; A Text Book of Chemistry.

No. II.

Art.		Page
I.	American Poetry	161
II.	The Ethical Philosophy of Plato	175
III.	Bishop Temple	191
IV.	The Divine Life and the New Birth	198
V.	The Argentine Republic	218
VI.	Athanasius the Great	237
VII.	The Pastoral Epistles	263
VIII.	The Greek Church	280
Notices of Books		299

Sermons by Henry Melvill, B. D.; Sermons by Rev. Stopford Brooke, M. A.; Apostolic Succession in the Church of England; Ante-Nicene Library; Sketches of Creation; The Andes and the Amazon; Art-Thoughts; Our New Vicar; The Church Idea; John Ploughman's Talk; Ancient States and Empires; Chambers' Encyclopædia; The Romance of Spanish History; Lost in the Jungle; Old Testament Shadows of New Testament Truths; Wild Sports of the World; The History of Civilization; History of Joseph Bonaparte; The History of American Socialisms; American Political Economy; A German Course; Creation a Recent Work of God; In Spain and a Visit to Portugal; Immortality; The Bazar Book of Decorum; Haydn and Other Poems; History of England from the Death of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada, by James Anthony Froude, M. A.

No. III.

Art.		Page
I.	The Modern Novel	321
II.	Prof. George Wilson	334
III.	Paul and Tertius, or Science and Revelation	350
IV.	A Pan-Anglican Synod	383
V.	A Plea for a Commentary for To-Day	389
VI.	The Pastoral Epistles	399
VII.	The Criteria of the Faith	417
VIII.	Clerical Advantages and Disadvantages	427
IX.	Tractarianism and Voluntaryism	442
Notices of Books		462

The Reformation of the Church of England; The Lay Reader; Homiletics and Pastoral Theology; A History of Christian Doctrine; Christianity and Greek Philosophy; Twenty-Ninth Annual Report of New York Prison Association; The Nations Around; The Threefold Grace of the Holy Trinity; The Life of Bismarck; Memoir of Rev. John Scudder, M. D.; Lifting the Veil; The History of Hortense; Wonders of the Human Body; Wonders of Glass-Making in all Ages; The Sublime in Nature; Wonders of Italian Art; Pamphlets.

No. IV.

Art.		Page
I.	Late Works on Anglican Orders	481
II.	The Fall of the Temporal Papacy	492
III.	Doctor Craik and His Reviewer	509
IV.	Bishop Ravenscroft	526
V.	The Pastoral Epistles	553
VI.	The Life and the Light	570
VII.	The Literature of the Age of Revolutions	582
VIII.	Italian Universities	589
IX.	The English Reformers and English Puritans Contrasted	606
Book Notices		623

Robertson's Sermons; Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vols. XV. and XVI.; A Treatise on the Christian Doctrine of Marriage; Opinions concerning the Bible Law of Marriage; The Early Years of Christianity; Self-Help; History of the American Civil War; Christ in Song; The Theology of Christ; Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon; The Rob Roy on the Jordan, Nile, Red Sea, Gennesareth, etc.; Life of Mary Russell Mitford; Home Influence; The New Timothy; Free Russia; The American Annual Cyclopedia; Bible Notes for Daily Readers; A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures; An English-Greek Lexicon.

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—APRIL, 1870.—No. 1.

ART. I.—JOHN KEBLE, THE POET-PASTOR.

The Christian Year: Thoughts in verse for the Sundays and Holy days throughout the year. Boston, E. P. Dutton & Co.; New York, Pott & Amery.
Miscellaneous Poems, New York, Pott & Amery.
Lyra Innocentium, New York, Pott & Amery.
On Eucharistical Adoration.
Catholic Subscription to the XXXIX. Articles.
Sermons, Parochial, Occasional, and Academical.
A Memoir of the REV. JOHN KEBLE, M. A. *By the* RIGHT HON. SIR J. T. COLERIDGE, D. C. L., *Oxford and London, James Parker & Co. New York, Pott & Amery; Cooper Union, Fourth Avenue.*

NOT fifty years since a volume of Poems was published by an obscure Parish Clergyman in England, which received a welcome unexpected, and almost unexampled. It seemed to touch a new chord in the Christian world. It stirred hearts in their hidden depths. It moved the young and the old, without reference to party, not only in the Anglican Church, but in widely differing communions. Nor was it an effervescent effect. Sir John Coleridge

heard on the 22d of June, 1827, that his copy of the "Christian Year" was on its road from Oxford. He received it on the next day. From that time until the beginning of January, 1854, were sold *one hundred and eight thousand* copies in *forty-three* editions. The circulation never afterwards flagged. During the nine months after Keble's death, there were published *seven* editions, comprising *eleven thousand* copies. All probabilities indicate that the popularity of the work will increase rather than diminish. In England and America, it cheers numberless Christian homes, whose libraries would be esteemed incomplete if it did not grace some shelf. It has traced itself on the hearts, and memories, and lives of multitudes. It adorns essays. It is quoted in sermons. It is discussed in Reviews. Its familiar lines are read on the pages of Hymn-Books, and, chanted by Christian Assemblies in the most distant parts of the world, rise in majestic volumes of harmony to Heaven as part of the universal worship addressed by the universal Church to the universal Father.

The extensive success of such a volume is more wonderful when we consider within what comparatively limited circles the noblest creations of human genius are perused. Dispense with the classic training of the Academy, and the College, and in how many minds would Homer, and Demosthenes, and Virgil, and Horace, and Cicero, kindle the glow of enthusiastic admiration? The grim and ghastly pictures of Dante, drawn with a master's power, fascinate the few. The exhaustless fancies of Petrarch, and Ariosto, and Tasso do not charm the multitude. Milton's matchless sublimities, embracing Earth, and Hell, and Heaven, and Time and Eternity are more known by report than by perusal. We are told that the genius of Shakspeare seldom in comedy or tragedy, crowds the theatre. Byron, with the passions of a demon, and the intellect of an angel, is no longer adored, and devoured. Thomson, and Goldsmith, and Campbell, with the glow of a true inspiration, and the polish of a true culture, do not fill the pockets of the publisher. The profits of Longfellow, and Bryant, and Tennyson, will probably be buried in their graves. In this age when steam and electricity would belt the world with iron that they may turn it into gold, Poetry is not a lucrative art. The Muse may starve amid the boundless wealth of her own creations. Yet John Keble's verses are on the lists of the sharpest publishers,

and will probably continue to yield a perpetual revenue. Notwithstanding, the verses of themselves can no more be compared to those of many Poets in England, and America than the chirp of the robin to the melody of the nightingale, or the wing of the dove to the pinion of the eagle.

There must, however, evidently be some true basis for a popularity so extensive, and so enduring. If Keble had not touched the heart of the world he would not have opened the pocket of the world. Where then is the explanation of his success? It certainly cannot be ascribed to any very extraordinary genius. The circulation of his Poems far surpasses the measure of his gifts. Perhaps there is not an image, or an expression in all his works which breathes with the highest inspiration. The very necessities of his task prevented the application of his theory. When preparing for his lectures as Professor of the Divine Art in Oxford, he wrote to his future biographer:

"My notion is to consider Poetry as a vent for overcharged feelings, or a full imagination, and so account for the various classes into which Poets naturally fall by a reference to the various objects which are apt to fill and overpower the mind so as to require some sort of relief. Then there will come in a grand distinction between what I call Primary and Secondary Poets; the first *poetising* for their own relief; the second for any other reason."

Now this is unquestionably a statement of correct principles. Reason deliberately chooses its theme, industriously prepares its materials, thoughtfully unfolds its arguments. Inspiration, on the other hand, is free, is spontaneous, is impulsive. It does not select its topic, but is rather seized by its topic. It is a fire kindled by a divine breath, not sustained by supplied faggots. It should grow out of life as a flower unfolds from a blossom, as a stream sparkles from a hill, as song bursts from a bird, as light flows from a star. The Poem fabricated for a stated occasion, on a selected theme, for a particular expectation, is usually prose in verse. It is the artificial rose, perhaps beautiful, and admired for the skill of its construction, but without the color, and the fragrance of the original as it hung on its stem, blushing in the morn bathed with dew, and light. There is an inexplicable charm in fancy, and sensibility, and rhythm which utterly escapes the frigidity of deliberation, and which alone stamps the creation of genius with the im-

press of immortality. We do not now speak of Didactic Poetry, but of those purer productions of the Epic, Tragic, and Lyric Art which alone are properly within the magic circle; and the truth of the theory may be tested by comparing a line of Homer, or Anacreon, or Horace, or Tasso, or Milton, or Shakspeare, or Burns, or Byron, bearing the unmistakable signature of genius, with the best passages of any composition in verse from any writer on any *assigned* subject. Now Keble in his "Christian Year," by compelling himself regularly to prepare certain lines on topics suggested by other minds, occurring in a prescribed order, was clearly placed by the necessities of his position without the limits of his own theory, making spontaneity a condition of inspiration, as is shown by a certain monotonous uniformity, which in despite of numerous merits and beauties, becomes often tiresome, and even painful; and also by the fact that the grandest subjects disappoint us in their treatment, while inferior topics are often invested with a true poetic charm. When Good Friday brings him to the Cross, he sinks into the tamest measures, where we expect him to be transported as Earth shakes, and Hell groans, and Heaven darkens around the Divine Victim whose atoning death is to purchase for His redeemed an eternal life in glory.

Besides as Keble was deficient in the highest attributes of creative genius, so he often exhibits a want of that delicate perception of the power of words, and the music of rhythm, which so invariably characterize those lines living from age to age in the heart, and memory, like some divine song which almost seems to have floated down from higher realms to bless and brighten earth. His very letters show no traces of that exquisite taste in the niceties of language which frequently fascinates in the most casual epistles of Burns and Byron. We may be permitted to adduce a few instances which will illustrate our meaning, and establish our assertion. In the verses on Advent Sunday describing our Lord a word is used with a most singular infelicity, and not at all comporting with that majesty belonging to the incarnate God.

"Meanwhile He *paces* through th' adoring crowd."

We can scarcely conceive a greater departure from taste and propriety. No gait is less dignified than the one indicated. Besides, there is no congruity between it, and the image suggested by the beautiful line which follows.

"Calm as the march of some majestic cloud."

Yet even here a criticism may be ventured. A number of clouds in succession might be compared to the *march* of an army, while the word does not at all apply to a *solitary* cloud moving over the Heavens.

Some of the stanzas on the Fourth Sunday in Advent are beautiful both in conception and expression. The thought is often exquisite, the rhythm sweet, and the impression enduring. We find here some of the surest proofs of Keble's genius. Yet there occurs an instance of the same bluntness in the use of language. A common word is employed, marring an image otherwise striking and beautiful.

"These eyes, that dazzled now, and weak,
At glancing motes in sunshine *wink*,
Shall see the King's full glory break,
Nor from the blissful vision shrink."

The Poem on St. Stephen's day has admirably and even wonderfully caught and depicted the radiance beaming from the martyr's face, when upturned from the violence of earth, it reflected the glory of the Saviour shining through the opened gates of Heaven. Although even here in the third line a word occurs describing indeed a rapid comet, or a shooting star, but which, we venture to assert, has no application to the sun rising from the flaming east in his morning majesty to roll over the skies with a motion steady and undiscernible.

"As rays around the source of light
Stream upward ere he glow in sight,
And watching by his future *flight*
Set the clear heavens on fire."

We might adduce many such instances. We could show numerous violations of poetic laws. We could demonstrate a frequent and prevailing and painful obscurity, not affected indeed by the ingenuous Keble, but which seems *intended* by some of our modern Poets, who convert a blemish into a beauty, and would establish a canon of taste forever at war with the acknowledged Greek, and Latin, and English Classics.

We have now done with the invidious work of the critic. It is a pleasure to pass from faults to merits. We would rather praise the

grace and perfume of the flower than morosely censure its weak stem, or imperfect leaf. Before, however, we endeavor to ascertain what is the true foundation of Keble's deserved fame, we must acquit ourselves of the imputation that any previous remark is intended to intimate that inspiration is opposed to industry. The true Poet must as assiduously cultivate his powers as the true Orator or the true Philosopher. Fecundity of ideas and felicity of expression are the results of labor. The polish of verse is often due to toil. First, there is a fulness of thoughts acquired by diligence, and then there is a culture of style which presumes application. But when the mind through observation and discipline is in a certain state, the occasions of Poetry will be spontaneous, suggested by the incidents of the life, flashing like fire from the soul, shining with the glow of inspiration; and yet when the thought has been caught in some happy moment of elevation, and imprisoned in words of music, there may follow through years all the toilsome and deliberate processes of the most severe, and exacting, and painful criticism. The creation of the Artist born in his spirit, is not transferred to the picture, or shaped in the marble to its final perfection, without many wearisome touches of the brush and the chisel.

And now the question remains—how shall we explain Keble's popularity notwithstanding Keble's defects? So wide an appreciation by the most humble, and the most learned in nearly every part of Christendom must have some sufficient basis. That poetical genius in a certain measure was required for such results, no man can dispute. Keble had unquestionably a warm heart, a sensibility to nature, a vigorous fancy, and with frequent blemishes, also frequent felicities of expression. In his sphere he is a poet who has attained a more remarkable success, than many writers, who, with far more conspicuous gifts, have achieved not popularity, but immortality. To explain such a phenomenon we must consider not only the man, but his theme. We have seen that this fettered the genius of our author, and by the very nature of the task it imposed constrained a monotony inconsistent with his own theories of inspiration. If it had its defects, it had also its advantages. If it chained the poet's fancy, it warmed the poet's heart. If it limited the range of his creative power, it extended the circle of his willing audience. The success of Keble is owing to his adaptation to his theme, and the sympathies which it elici-

ted. Homer, and Shakspeare, and Byron would never have compelled genius from the clouds to labor at so monotonous a task, and if forced to turn the daily wheel there would have been visible not the fire of the master, but the weariness of the slave. Keble's powers were exactly suited to Keble's work, and hence the key to Keble's fame, which after all, sanctified by religion, and given to the Church, has become transfigured with a brighter glory than crowns any poet's head, whose theme contracted to time, loses the elevation of eternity. If the great mission of England's first Christian Bard was monotonous, it was yet sublime. Next to the Bible we know nothing which so stirs the heart of Christendom as our own venerable prayer book. It links itself to the religious past of the world. It concentrates within itself the treasures of ages. It expresses in their proportion all the doctrines of the Holy Scripture, and touches in their depths all the sensibilities of the believer's heart. It expresses not alone the consciousness of the Anglican Church, but of universal Christendom. It exhibits both the truths and the facts of our redemption. It displays with tragic power the whole life of our Saviour from His birth to His baptism; from His baptism to His cross; from His cross to His grave; from His grave to His throne; from His throne to His judgment, and then unfolds beyond those scenes of glory where He communicates to His people the fulness of His own immortality. It has enshrined in its hymns, and lessons, and collects the memories of saints, martyrs, confessors, and apostles, so that each revolving year unfolds and revives their heroic struggles, and victories. It perpetuates the faith, and order, and sacraments of the Church, as an inheritance dear, and sacred, and venerated. Only from such a past could Keble's Muse have caught an inspiration. Amid modern religious organizations she could have given forth no song. The Catholic Church, like the dim aisles, and pictured windows, and sacred altars of some ancient Cathedral, awoke strains from all the chords of her harp. Keble, we think, erred in not adding to veneration of the past, faith in the present, and hope for the future. A sadness breathes through all his strains. We seldom hear the lyric notes of victory. He lingers lovingly amid the ruins of Zion, mourning over her desolation, but never brightens into prophetic joy, as he beholds the foundations again laid, the walls restored, the pillars elevated, the dome replaced, and

glory once more filling the temple, while the whole world crowds to its opened gates, and repaired shrines. Gleams of millenial light seldom flash through his song. Yet, whatever his defects, no man has ever lived, so well fitted to seize, and fix in verse, the genius of the Anglican Church. As her child by baptism and her priest by choice, acquainted with her history, and attached to her customs, trained amid the scenes of a Rectory, and familiar with the retreats of Oxford, he had every opportunity to imbibe her spirit, while his warm affections, his deep reverence, his fine sensibilities, his poetic powers, all marked him for signal success in a peculiar work, where a richer genius might have found no fascination, and might have achieved no results. The glory of Keble is not that he possessed the highest measure of poetic gifts. Others have glowed with brighter fires, and soared into loftier regions. Nor did our Christian Bard impress perfection on his verses. Their execution discovers many blemishes. But in his sphere he did what no other man could have performed so well. He did it for all time, so that it need not be repeated. He did it for all Christendom, so that it will every where find a response. He did it for all eternity, so that his crown will never fade away. His poetry linked with the Church he loved, will share her immortality, and be read and sung when brighter creations grow dim, and be known in those millenial periods of our earth, of which it affords but few prophetic recognitions.

But it is time to approach another and a nobler aspect of Keble's life. It is indeed a great mission to study in Nature her forms of beauty, and in Religion the glory of truth, with a view to their expression in the melodies of verse. The Poet is an interpreter of God to man. Still his vocation is from within. He represents himself. He has no external commission. The minister of the Gospel on the other hand is selected by the Church, and stands before the world with the authority of Heaven. Perhaps the most interesting phase of Keble's life is found in his position as Pastor. We do not refer to that commercial relation by which the popular preacher gives so much eloquence for so much money, and is tolerated just so long as the pews are rented, and the services crowded. Nothing can be conceived more selfish, and icy, and repulsive. But with suitable learning, and ability for the Pastoral office only to be obtained through severe collegiate and theolo-

gical discipline there are certain genial sympathies, leading to cheerful labor, and sacrifice, which bind the minister to the people by links of love, and invest him with the brightest halo which has ever crowned our humanity, and make him, as nearly as our natures permit, unite the affections of the man with the majesty of the Angel. Mullois has well remarked,

"Men must be loved in order that they may be well instructed; whatever they may be, be they ever so guilty, or indifferent or ungrateful, or however sunk in crime, before all, and above all, they must be loved. The question is not to ascertain what they are worth, but to save them such as they are. Our age is a great prodigal Son; let us help it to return to its paternal home. Now is the time to recall the words of the admirable Fenelon. O ye Pastors, put away all your narrowness of heart. Enlarge, enlarge your compassion. You know nothing if you know merely how to command, to reprove, to correct, to expound the letter of the law. Be fathers; but that is not enough—be as mothers. It is not enough by essays of reasoning any more than by the sword, that the moral world is to be swayed; a little knowledge, much sound sense, and much more heart, that is what is requisite to raise the great mass, the people, and to cleanse, and purify them. To be able to reason is human, very human—but to lose one's life, to sacrifice self, is something unearthly, divine, possessing a magic power. Self-devotion moreover is the only argument against which human malevolence can find no answer."

In these beautiful extracts French genius has explained in touching and eloquent words the spell, and power of the Pastoral office. Learning is necessary. Judgment is necessary. Discipline is necessary. But above all manly Christian sympathies, next to the unction of the Holy Ghost, are the surest tokens of success. St. Augustin says: "Love first and then you may do what you choose."

Now the chief attraction in Keble's life is, that as Rector in his Parish, he embodied these sentiments and principles. He had simplicity of character. He had warmth of heart. He had quick sensibilities. Above the Christian Poet rose the Christian man, and the Christian Pastor. He bore humanity on his soul before the Eternal Throne. His interest was in his people, not in a class. He felt for both rich and poor. Youth and age shared his affections. Cottage and mansion received his attention, and returned their love. Like the Good Shepherd, he knew his flock by name, and seemed to take interest in everything relating to their temporal or spiritual welfare. When absent the most humble are mentioned in his letters, showing they had a place in his

memory, and in his prayers. We can scarcely conceive a more attractive spectacle on earth than the venerable Keble, with his white locks and benignant countenance, standing in the midst of the teachers and pupils of his Parochial schools, giving instruction and noting progress, and utterly regardless of the fact that as a Poet and a Theologian, he was known over the world, and might give his fame to all future time. Sir John Coleridge in his admirable memoir, appends a letter from Peter Young, an assistant Curate at Hurseley, which gives a most simple, yet vivid account of Keble as Pastor. He says:

"In his pastoral work generally, while he had, as every one knows, a strong sense of the dignity of the Priesthood, his chief personal feeling, if I may venture to say so, was that which St. Paul expresses when he says, 'Ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake'—he held himself at the service of any of his parishioners at any time, and almost for any purpose. He accounted himself their 'minister,' whose duty and delight it was to help them in every way. In cases of prolonged sickness he tried to pay his visit on particular days, that it might be expected and prepared for, and if the sick person were near at hand, he would visit him as nearly as possible at the same hour every day, his wish being in this as in every thing else, to adapt himself to what he thought would be most acceptable to those for whom he ministered. One case I especially remember, of an *old woman whom he used to visit in this way every evening regularly for some time, just before she settled for the night.*

"Every member of his flock was a charge to him; but his warm anxiety, it may perhaps be said, was for the young men, and women, and for the very old. Their death was to him the loss of a personal friend, and he loved to recall their sayings or anything characteristic in their dress and manners."

Sir John Coleridge also gives us a most striking portrait of Keble in the Pulpit, softened by the touches of a beautiful friendship, which began amid the scenes of Oriel, was continued through life, and will doubtless survive the grave to bloom in an eternal glory. He says:

"The characteristic of his ministrations in the Church or elsewhere, was, as might have been expected, that which was the animating and presiding spirit of all his life, a perfectly simple and sincere sense of his own unworthiness combined with a hearty desire, that every talent he had received, all his strength, all his time, all his energies were consecrated to God's service, and that service so high, so holy, that it was never to be thought of even but with the most reverential feeling of which he was capable. The last was never more marked than when he was engaged in the administration of the Sacraments. He was not what is commonly called an eloquent reader or preacher; his voice was not powerful, nor his ear perfect for har-

mony of sound; nor had he in the popular sense great gifts of delivery; but in spite of all this you could not but be deeply impressed both by his reading, and his preaching when he read. You saw that he felt and he made you feel, that he was the ordained servant of God, delivering His words, or leading you, but as one of like infirmities and sins with your own, in your prayers. When he preached, it was with an affectionate almost plaintive earnestness, which was very moving. His sermons were at all times full of that Scriptural knowledge which was a remarkable quality in him as a divine. Like one of the old Fathers, he seemed to have caught by continual and devout study, somewhat of the idiom and manner of Scripture."

It is no marvel that such a man, so pure, so simple, so earnest, so affectionate, so devoted, so gifted, should have died in peace lamented by his Parish, the Church, the world. The wreath of the Poet fades before the halo of the Christian, and the crown of the Pastor.

We have reserved in conclusion a passage in Keble's life which cannot be overlooked. He had seen the Protestant position of the Anglican Church pushed to an extreme which seemed to make opposition to Rome the test and end of the Christian religion. Justification by Faith had been preached as the entire Gospel. Subjective experiences had been placed above moral duties. The glow of emotion had been more esteemed than exactitude of life. The Order of the Church was undervalued. The Sacraments of the Church were neglected. The observances of the Church were relaxed. The ceremonies of the Church were despised. Reverence was expiring. Temples of worship were deserted, and decaying. It was not strange that the earnest spirits of Oxford should have been stirred in the nineteenth century as they had been stirred in the eighteenth century. As Methodism had moved in one direction, Tractarianism now moved in the opposite direction. The pendulum having swung too far one way, was in danger of swinging too far the other way. An extreme of Protestantism brought an extreme of Catholicity. Until the issue of Tract numbered ninety, the work accomplished was most commendable, and will leave its beneficent impress on the Church forever. For that noted paper it seems from the Memoir of Sir John Coleridge, that Pusey and Keble had an equal responsibility with Newman. We believe it attempted an impossibility, and has been the source of that effort which would unite the Anglican, and Greek, and Latin Churches, by sweeping from the world the whole work of the English Refor-

mation. In his views of Eucharistical Adoration, and in his views of the Holy Mary, Keble certainly went as far towards Rome as any man can go without passing the line which separates from the Papal Communion, while in all other respects he was an essential and enthusiastic Anglican. As the smoke of the Tractarian battle lifts itself from the Church, we are preparing to see that between her Protestantism and her Catholicity, instead of antagonism, there is a beautiful harmony. The one but opposes temporary and particular error. The other asserts universal and eternal truth. Or rather Catholicity includes Protestantism, as the atmosphere of our world embraces not only the soils which sustain the life of man, but the rocks which contribute to his defence.

ART. II.—SOTERIOLOGY.—(*Concluded.*)

MR. OXENHAM, in his very valuable work, on "The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement," remarks:

"The Tridentine *Catechism*, though not possessing direct dogmatic authority, is universally accepted and used in the [R. C.] Church, as containing a clear and luminous exposition of Christian doctrine on the Creed, Sacraments, Decalogue, and Lord's Prayer. In commenting on the fourth article of the Apostles' Creed, it recounts the 'benefits merited for us by the Passion of Christ,' which are summed up under the four heads of deliverance from sin, and from its penalty, rescue from the tyranny of the devil, and the opening to us of the kingdom of heaven. Its efficacy is explained to consist in its being a full and entire satisfaction, offered after a certain and admirable manner to the Father, a most acceptable sacrifice to God, and a redemption from our vain conversation; while it also gives us a bright example of patience, humility, charity, obedience, meekness, and constancy even unto death. (Cat. ed. Par Pars i. c. 5, Q. 14, 15.)

"No explanations are added of questions disputed among the school-men, or stirred at the Reformation. The expression on which some of the Reformers so strenuously insisted, that the death of Christ *reconciled God to us* is not used at all in the Catechism, which confines itself to stating, in the language of Scripture, that He reconciled us to God. (Ib. i. c. 3, Q. 3.) The *Augsburg Confession* (Art. 3) says, 'ut reconciliaret nobis Patrem,' as does also the second of the xxxix. Articles."

The Tridentine Soteriology was largely commented on (1581) in the works of *Robert Bellarmin.* This eminent Papal theolo-

gian was born (1502) at Monte-Pulciano in Tuscany, became a Jesuit, was made (1599) a cardinal and (1602) Archbishop of Capua. His great work is entitled, 'Disputationes de controversiis fidei adversus hujus temporis hæreticos.' Justification he declares to be twofold. (1). The infusion of an inherent principle or habit of grace or charity, and (2). The good works or right external life which is the result.

"Sicut aer, cum illustratur a sole per idem lumen, quod recipit, desinit esse tenebrosus et incipit esse lucidus, sic etiam homo per eandem justitiam sibi a sole justitiæ donatam atque infusam desinit esse injustus, delente videlicet lumine gratiæ tenebras peccatorum." (De Justif. II. 2.)

Those interested in the famous Thomist and Scotist controversy on the 'Cause of the Incarnation,' would do well to consult Mr. Oxenham's work, above referred to, Chapter VI. The Scotists held "that Christ's human nature was predestined, antecedent to man's fall, as the model of ours; and that Christ would in any case have come to be the second Adam and Head of the mystical body." Joann. Duns Scot. *Summa*, Pars. III., quæst. i. Art. 3.

We have seen in the preceding pages abundant proof that the doctrine of the Vicarious satisfaction of Christ for human sin was no discovery of the Reformation era. The Continental Reformers, while they adopted in the main the Anselmic system, differed from it, in some features.

1. The Anselmic view, is almost entirely *objective*—it treats of sin in its relation to God. The Reformation added to it the *subjective* element of faith—Justification by faith—Luther's "Articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ." The continental reformers held to a "Mystical union;" but substitute *faith* in the place of the sacraments. "*Sola fides justificat.*" On this point consult the '*Confessio Augustana*,' (presented at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530,) articles iv. xx.; '*Confessio Belgica*,' (composed by Guido von Bres, 1562,) Art. xxii. '*Heidelberg Catechism*,' (1562) Art. der Dankbarkeit; Bullinger's '*II Helvetic Confession*,' (1564) c. 15, 16; '*Concordienformel*,' (Formula Concordiæ, drawn up at Magdeburg by the Lutherans, 1577,) *passim.*

2. The formal separation of Christ's work into His *active* and *passive righteousness.* This distinction was not exactly identical

with the more recent distinction of active and passive *obedience.* In the latter distinction Christ's *passive* obedience frees the soul from punishment, but does not give it any title to eternal reward. With the German Reformers Christ's obedience to law constituted a part of His atoning work. This distinction is not in the Augsburg Confession or its 'Apology,' (both the work of Phil. Melanchthon,) nor in the larger and smaller catechisms of Luther. But we find it in the later continental symbols. Formula Concordiæ, pp. 684, 686, 696; II. Helvetic Confession; Heidelberg Catechism; Formula Consensus Ecclesiarum Helveticarum, (drawn up, 1675, by Heidegger and Turretin in opposition to Piscatorius and the School of Saumur, who contended for a general Atonement, and that only Christ's *passive* righteousness constituted the Atonement,) Article xv.

It is a noteworthy fact that Martin Luther held to the old theory of "Satan's Claims." See his Easter sermon, A. D. 1530, commentary on the Book of Job, and other passages cited by *Weisse*, p. 29. On the other hand Calvin, Gerhardt and Quenstedt originated the blasphemous idea that Christ in His passion endured all the pains of hell (!), which Bellarmin well said, was "a new and unheard of heresy." See Calvin's Inst.* Gerhardt *Loci Theol.* xvii. 2, 54; Quenstedt, p. 354. Such was also the teaching of Jonathan Edwards. See Campbell's *Nature of the Atonement*, p. 58.

Hugo de Groot, or *Grotius*, was born (1583) at Delft, in Holland, of which place his father was burgomaster. He was the most distinguished jurist of his age. In 1618 he was involved in the persecution of the Arminian party by Prince Maurice, and was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment in the Castle of Louvestein. From this he escaped by the ingenious contrivance of his wife, who had him conveyed through the prison gates in a book-case. He died at Rostock on his way to Sweden, in the month of August, 1645.

Grotius was the most learned man of his age, being the master of all literature extant, and acquainted with every known art and science. With regard to the Atonement he was the originator of the celebrated theory of "*Acceptilation.*" His legal studies no doubt suggested to his mind this solution of the great problem.

* See Calvin's Instit. Bk. i. 15, 4, 12, 18; ii. 3, 6; xvi. 5–7, 10.

The term is post-classic, and borrowed from the Pandects of Justinian. (Acceptilatio; acceptum—receipt and fero, latus.) In the later Latin *Acceptilatio* denotes "the verbal acquittance of a debt by a creditor without payment." It is a "Solutio imaginaria," the acceptance by the creditor of nothing, or a part in payment for the whole. It is a commercial term, never employed in criminal jurisprudence. We have seen that Duns Scotus maintained that "God accepts the satisfaction of Christ, not because it is infinite; but because in mercy, He contents Himself with that which is not infinite. . . . . For every oblation is at the value which God rates it." This theory, maintained by Scotus in his controversy with Aquinas, was revived by Grotius in his treatise against the Socinians, and has been generally adopted by Arminians.

The work of Grotius referred to was entitled, "Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi," 1617. He starts with the legal maxim (c. 2:)

"Punire non est actus competens parti offensæ qua toli." God is indeed the injured party, but when He punishes it is not qua pars offensa (sicut jurisconsultus canit non qua jurisconsultus, sed qua musicus.) The right to punish belongs to God's majesty as such, and is independent of all injury. There is a design in punishment (ordinis nimirum conservationem et exemplum;) not to show justice and execute vengeance, but to prove that evil is punished.

"Nihil ergo iniquitatis in eo est, quod Deus, cujus est summa potestas ad omnia per se non injusta, nulli ipse legi obnoxius, conciatibus et morte Christi uti voluit ad statuendum exemplum grave adversus culpas immenses nostrum omnium, quibus Christus erat conjunctissimus natura regno, vadimonio." (c. 4.)

Punishment is voluntatis quidam effectus. (c. 5, p. 310.) Law is a product of God's will, by which He is not Himself bound. He has the power to alter or abrogate it at pleasure, for the Lawmaker is above the law. It follows that penalty is positive—not natural and necessary. All positive laws are relaxable. Law is a particular product or effect of the divine will. The Deity can abrogate law, and has done so in the case of the ceremonial law. It is not necessarily and absolutely required, that every sinner should be punished in a manner corresponding with his sin. A promise to reward must always be fulfilled, but a threat to punish is of a different nature. The All-Wise Legislator had great cause to relax His law; else mankind would not have reverenced Him and His mercy.

This view the jurist Grotius has borrowed from human jurisprudence. He reduces everything to the will of God. According to Anselm and his followers the will and nature of God cannot be thus separated. Law is the pure and natural expression of the Divine Mind—it is the manifestation of Deity—it is incapable of relaxation or abrogation. But according to Grotius it is competent for God to relax the law and save the transgressor. Man on account of sin has incurred the penalty of eternal death. (Gen. ii. 17.) This law with its penalty is a positive enactment, and can be relaxed or abrogated. In fact it has been relaxed, for believers in Christ do not suffer the penalty threatened. There comes in between strict exaction and absolute release a medium course—a tempering or relaxation. "The law is dispensed with in reference to a certain class of persons." Those statutes which are accompanied with an oath or a promise of reward are unreleasable. "It is not necessary that the sinner should suffer punishment exactly corresponding with the transgression."

But the question now arises, "To what purpose then are the sufferings of the Redeemer of mankind?" To this Grotius replies:—

"Although the Deity can remit the penalty so far as *He* is concerned; yet, so far as the created universe is concerned, He cannot remit it prudently. God does not exist in solitude, but has called into existence a creation of which He is the Ruler. It is therefore unsafe to remit the penalty without any satisfaction. And on this account the Atonement of Christ is necessary."

So many and great sins could not be remitted, unless God at the same time gave *expression* to His detestation of sin. (Chap. v.)

According to Anselm the death of Christ is a satisfaction of divine justice, and satisfaction is a strict equivalent (quid pro quo). There can be no relaxation of law, for satisfaction to Anselm denotes the substitution of an exact and literal equivalent. The sufferings of Christ are of the same worth as the punishment of man. But to Grotius and the Arminian School satisfaction is an accepted, nominal equivalent. It is not a '*quid pro quo*,' but an '*aliud pro quo*.' The Atonement is not founded on the intrinsic sufficiency of the sufferings of Christ; but they are simply *accepted* as sufficient.

"It is necessary that the will of the ruler should come in, that the punishment of one person should be substituted for that of another. This interfering act extends to the value of the thing substituted, and not merely to the substitution itself."

The work of Grotius, 'Defensio Fidei," was written in opposition to the heresy of Socinus. The latter urged that satisfaction is incompatible with remission of sin: Grotius replies by drawing a distinction between satisfaction and payment (solutio.) The latter excludes remission, because justice can demand nothing more when the debt is fully paid. But remission is not inconsistent with satisfaction. Socinus (he says) is right, *if* satisfaction means the complete and literal infliction of an equivalent to the punishment due. But there is a relaxation or remission which is mercy, because it does not exact the full punishment from the substitute. "For ye are bought with a price." (1 Cor. vi. 20.) "Who gave himself a ransom for all." (1 Tim. ii. 6.) This τιμη ον αντίλυτρον expresses the divine abhorrence of sin, and secures the welfare of the created universe.

Strangely enough Grotius disclaims the title of *Acceptilation* as applied to his theory, and endeavors to thrust it upon the Socinians. He says:

"Acceptilation denotes the act by which payment is not exacted at all. Hence this term has application only in civil law. Justice receives *something* in the Atonement, for Christ has offered satisfaction of some sort."

But Baur justly remarks,

"There is no other theory to which the term *Acceptilation* can with better right be applied, than to that of Grotius;" (*Versöhnungslehre*, p. 428,) and Tholuck concurs with him in this criticism.

"The central point (of the death of Christ,) in the view of Grotius as well as Socinus, is the *moral impression* which it produces, but with this difference, that this moral result is regarded by Grotius as negative, by Socinus as positive. Grotius regards the moral effect of the death of Christ as the exhibition of punishment connected with sin; while Socinus views it in the results of the moral character displayed by Christ in His death." (*Baur, vers.:* p. 431.)

We cannot better conclude this monograph than by a brief survey of the Soteriology of *Anglican* divines. In the xxxix. Articles the doctrine can be gathered from i. ii. iii. iv. x. xi. xv. xvii. xviii. xxxi. The *Homilies* of the Church of England, two books of plain discourses composed at the time of the Reformation, are

referred to in Art. xxxv. as containing "a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times." In the First Part of the Homily of Salvation, (ascribed to Arb. Cranmer) we read :—

"For the more full understanding hereof, it is our parts and duties ever to remember the great mercy of God, how that (all the world being wrapped in sin by breaking of the law) God sent His only Son our Saviour Christ, into this world, to fulfill the law for us, and, by shedding His most precious blood, to make a sacrifice and satisfaction, or (as it may be called) amends to His Father for our sins, to assuage His wrath and indignation conceived against us for the same.

The efficacy of Christ's passion and oblation.

"Insomuch that infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favor, and made His children, and inheritors of His Kingdom of Heaven. And they, which in act or deed do sin after their baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins in such sort, that there remaineth not any spot of sin, that shall be imputed to their damnation. . . . . But here may man's reason be astonied, reasoning after this fashion; if a ransom be paid for our redemption, then is it not given us freely. For a prisoner that paid his ransom is not let go freely; for if he go freely, then he goeth without ransom; for what is it else to go freely, than to be set at liberty without paying of ransom?

"Ans. This reason is satisfied by the great wisdom of God in this mystery of our redemption, who hath so tempered His justice and mercy together, that He would neither by His justice condemn us unto the everlasting captivity of the devil, and his prison of hell, remediless for ever, without mercy, nor by His mercy deliver us clearly, without justice, or payment of a just ransom; but with His endless mercy He joined His most upright and equal justice. His great mercy He showed unto us in delivering us from our former captivity, without requiring of any ransom to be paid, or amends to be made upon our parts, which thing by us had been impossible to be done. And whereas it lay not in us that to do, He provided a ransom for us, that was, the most precious Body and Blood of His own most dear and best beloved Son, Jesus Christ, who, besides this ransom, fulfilled the law for us perfectly. And so the justice of God and His mercy did embrace together, and fulfilled the mystery of our redemption."

"An Homily for Good-Friday, concerning the Death and Passion of our Saviour Jesus Christ," (ascribed to Taverner) begins thus :—

"It should not become us, well-beloved in Christ, being that people which be redeemed from the devil, from sin and death, and from everlasting damnation, by Christ, to suffer this time to pass forth without any meditation and remembrance of that excellent work of our redemption, wrought as about this time, through the great mercy and charity of our Saviour Jesus Christ, for us wretched sinners, and His mortal enemies. For if a mortal man's deed, done to the behoof of the commonwealth, be had in remembrance of us, with thanks for the benefit and profit which we receive thereby;

how much more readily should we have in memory this excellent act and benefit of Christ's death? Whereby He hath purchased for us the undoubted freedom and forgiveness of our sins, whereby He made at one the Father of heaven with us, in such wise, that He taketh us now for His loving children, and for the true inheritors, with Christ, His natural Son, of the Kingdom of heaven. And verily so much more doth Christ's kindness appear unto us, in that it pleased Him to deliver Himself of all His goodly honor, which He was equally in with His Father in heaven, and to come down into this vale of misery, to be made mortal man, and to be in the state of a most low servant, serving us for our wealth and profit; us, I say, which were His sworn enemies, which had renounced His holy law and commandments, and followed the lusts and sinful pleasures of our corrupt nature. And yet, I say, did Christ put Himself between God's deserved wrath and (Col. ii. 14) our sin, and rent that obligation, wherein we were in danger, to God, and paid our debt. Our debt was a great deal too great for us to have paid. And without payment, God the Father could never be at one with us. Neither was it possible to be loosed from this debt by our own ability. It pleased Him therefore to be the payer thereof, and to discharge us quite."

Nowell's Catechism thus teaches:

8. "Eiquid amplius de Christi morte dicendum est?

9. "Christum non communi modo morte in hominum conspectu mulctatum, sed et æternæ mortis honore perfusum fuisse . . . . . quo justo Dei judicio per omnia satisfaceret, iramque ejus plene placaret, pro nobis perpessum atque perfunctum esse. Peccatoribus enim quorum hic quasi personam Christus sustinuit, non præsentis modo, sed et futuræ etiam æternæque mortis dolores atque conciatus debentur. Quum vero humani generis perditi jam atque damnati culpam pariter, justamque pœnam ita in se susciperet atque sustineret, tam gravi metu, tentaque animi motu ac dolore perturbatus est, ut exclamaret, 'Deus meus, Deus meus, quare dereliquisti me!'"

Richard Hooker, says:

"Satisfaction is a work which justice requireth to be done for contentment of persons injured; neither is it in the eye of justice a sufficient satisfaction, unless it fully equal the injury for which we satisfy. Seeing then that sin against God, eternal and infinite, must needs be an infinite wrong; justice in regard thereof doth necessarily exact an infinite recompense, or else inflict upon the offender infinite punishment. Now because God was thus to be satisfied, and man not able to make satisfaction in such sort, His unspeakable love and inclination to save mankind from eternal death ordained in our behalf a Mediator, to do that which had been for any other impossible. Wherefore all sin is remitted in the only faith of Christ's passion, and no man without belief thereof is justified. [*Bonavent.*, in Lent. lib. iv. dist. xv. q. 9, q. i. t. iii. pars ii. p. 199. 'Etsi divina misericordia relinquit offensam homini dando gratiam, non tamen ita omnius relinquit, quin

etiam exigat de offensa satisfactionem per justitiam. Et quia homo non potuit pro tanta offensa satisfacere, ideo Deus dedit ei mediatorem qui satisfaceret pro offensa. Unde in *sola fide* passionis Christi remittitur omnis culpa, et sine fide ejus nullus justificatur. Et secundum hoc dicunt, quod omnis satisfactio nostra virtutem habet a satisfactione Christi.' Ed. Rom. 1596.] Faith alone maketh Christ's satisfaction ours; howbeit that faith alone which after sin maketh us by conversion His." (*Eccles. Pol. Bk. vi.* c. 5, [?].)

Bishop Pearson, says:

"We may be assured of *forgiveness of sins*, because Christ by His death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that He hath done so, we are assured, because He which before was angry with us, upon the consideration of Christ's death, becomes propitious unto us, and did ordain Christ's death to be a propitiation for us. (Rom. iii. 24, 25; 1 John ii. 1 & iv. 10.) It is evident therefore, that Christ did render God propitious unto us by His blood (that is, His sufferings unto death,) who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation, that is, a kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before He determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God, who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in Him upon the loss of man, is wrath and indignation. God therefore was most certainly offended before He gave a Redeemer; and though it must be true, that He 'so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son:' (John iii. 16) yet there is no incongruity in this, that a father should be offended with that son which He loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding therefore that God loved men whom He created, yet He was offended with them when they sinned, and gave His Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience He might be reconciled to them.

"This reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by Christ; (2 Cor. v. 18,) and that by virtue of His death, (Rom. v. 10, Col. i. 20.) In vain it is objected that the Scripture saith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but nowhere teacheth that He reconciled God to man; for in the language of Scripture, to reconcile a man to God, that is in our vulgar language to reconcile God to man, that is, to cause Him who before was angry and offended with him to be gracious and propitious to him. (1 Sam. xxix. 4, Matt. v. 23, 24, 1 Cor. vii. 11, Rom. v. 10.)" *Creed, Art. x. pages* 544, 545.

Bishop Gibson, says:

"1. Christ by His death made satisfaction to the Divine justice for the sins of mankind. (a.) By dying for us. 1 John iii. 16, 1 Cor. xv 3, Titus ii. 14, Rom. iv. 25, Heb. ii. 9, cf. Isaiah liii. 16, (b.) By bearing our sins, Heb. ix. 28, 1 Pet. ii. 29, cf. Is. liii. 4-6, (c.) By taking away our sins, 1 John iii. 5, Heb. ix. 26, Rev. i. 5, 1 John i. 7, (d.) By being a Propitiation for our sins. Rom. iii. 25, 1 John ii. 1, 2, (e.) By purchasing and redeeming (or ransoming) us with the price of His blood. Acts xx. 28, Matt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6, 1 Cor. vi. 20, 1 Pet. i. 19.

"2. The divine justice being satisfied, we are assured of the forgiveness of our sins through Christ, upon a sincere repentance. Mat. xxvi. 28, Luke xxiv. 47, Acts v. 38, Acts ii. 38, Acts xiii. 38, Acts x. 43, 2 Cor. v. 19, Eph. i. 7, Eph. iv. 32. (*Second Pastoral Letter*, p. 207.)

"3. Our sins being forgiven, we are *justified* by Christ in the sight of God. Acts xiii. 39, 1 Cor vi. 11, Rom. iii. 24, Rom. v. 9.

"4. Being justified by Christ, we are reconciled to God. Rom. v. 1, Rom. v. 10, Col. i. 20-22, 2 Cor. v. 18, 1 Pet. iii. 18, Eph. i. 6."

See also (if accessible) Bishop H. U. Onderdonk's very able charge on "The Atonement," in which he exposes with a masterly hand the weak points of the Anselmic and Calvinistic systems; arguing that the Atonement was offered as a satisfaction to Divine Holiness, not Divine Vengeance.

Let us sum up the Anglican Soteriology under the following twelve heads, embracing questions discussed by the theologians of the Early and Mediæval Church: *

1. What is the Church-view of the dogma of "Satan's Claims?" The Origenistic view is of course exploded. The divines of the English Church take no notice of "Satan's Claims," any further than that man in the Fall came under Satan's power of temptation, and that the punishment for sin is common to him and to Satan. The Church of course recognizes the personality of Satan as taught in Holy Scripture.

2. Is the Atonement a literal satisfaction of divine justice? The Communion Office declares that Christ "made (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world;" (*i. e.*) He redeemed mankind and made it *possible* for them to be delivered from the power and punishment of sin, and to be made everlastingly blessed in heaven.

3. Was the Atonement absolutely or relatively necessary? Our divines never pry into such theoretical questions. Whether God could, or could not have devised any other way of saving man, we know not. He has appointed this one, which is our only way of salvation. In this view, absolute and relative are unimportant terms.

4. Was Christ's death of infinite value?

* For the answers to these questions we are indebted to the kindness of the Right Revd., the Bishop of Connecticut.

This question also is not a practical one. But the authority of the Church favors the affirmative.

5. Was the Atonement general or limited?

It was general; but the Atonement must be carefully distinguished from salvation, which latter is limited.

6. What part has the mercy of God in it?

It was surely a signal display of the mercy of the Father, to provide the Atonement; of the Son, to give Himself as a sacrifice for sin; and of the Holy Ghost, to apply to us the benefits of the Atonement.

7. How far was Christ's death voluntary?

Entirely on His part, though the Father planned the Atonement.

8. Was the pain He endured the greatest possible?

Our divines leave such questions to the school-men to solve.

9. Did the Divine Nature suffer?

It did not; though the Atonement was made by the God-man.

10. Is there a mystical union between Christ and the believer?

Not in the sense of Aquinas. There is however a union between Christ and the believer through the intervention of the Holy Spirit.

11. Did Christ by active obedience earn for the believer a title to salvation?

The Church does not make such a distinction between active and passive obedience.

12. Were Christ's merits superabundant?

Not in the sense of Aquinas, who teaches works of supererogation on the part of the believer.

And now we close this brief and imperfect essay with the prayer to the great Head of the Church, that the error found therein may be overruled; and that, if it contain aught of good, that reward may be vouchsafed for which the Church's greatest Doctor prayed—"Thou hast written well concerning Me, Thomas: what wilt thou have therefore?"

"LORD, I desire nothing except THYSELF."

O Saviour of the world, Who by Thy Cross and precious Blood hast redeemed us, save us and help us, we humbly beseech Thee, O Lord!

ART. III.—POLYTHEISM AND MYTHOLOGY.

I. *Chips from a German Workshop.* By MAX MÜLLER, M. A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. 4 vols. 12mo. New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

II. *A Manual of Mythology in the Form of Question and Answer.* By the Rev. GEORGE W. COX, M. A., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. First American from the Second London Edition. New York. Leypoldt & Holt. 1868. 12mo. pp. 300.

III. *Primeval Man: An Examination of some recent Speculations.* By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. New York. George Routledge & Sons. 1869. 18mo., pp. 200.

Two sciences have arisen in these latter days demanding that we shall reconstruct our history of the early days of mankind, both with regard to its chronology and to some of the most important events in its narrative. But while agreeing in this point they diverge at more than a right angle in reference to another point of the most fundamental importance. These two sciences are Geology and Comparative Philology.

It is now about twenty years since Geologists began seriously to claim that they had discovered proof of the existence of man upon this Earth at a period in its history much earlier than had been generally believed. Even as early as Sir Charles Lyell's first visit to this country, in 1842–'3, he was informed that there were some indications of so great an antiquity for man in the lower part of the Mississippi valley. But so well grounded did he regard the commonly received chronology that he did not think it worth while to give the subject a serious consideration or the particular facts pointed out to him any careful examination. Since that time, as is well known, he has not only changed his opinion on this subject, but he has also written a volume for the purpose of advocating his more recently adopted view.

But the question, so far as geology is concerned, does not end here. The advocates of that science claim that the very same facts that show the early occupancy of the Earth by man show also, and by evidence equally as conclusive, that these early inhabitants

were in the lowest grade of savagery, scarcely, if at all, above the highest order of the monkey tribes.

It is not our purpose in the present Article to discuss the first of these two propositions at all. There can be no doubt, and there is no use in concealing the fact, that the tendency of opinion among scientific men is at present at least in favor of the doctrine of an earlier appearance of man than has been hitherto supposed to be reconcilable with the Mosaic account. But to the second opinion, which Geologists generally claim to have established, we propose to give a few moments' attention. And this we do from the standpoint of the other science named already in our Article, namely, Comparative Philology, or the science of Language.

And in order to see the force of the argument bearing on this doctrine, as well as the illustration which that science has thrown upon the more general subjects named at the head of this Article, and the leading topics of which we propose to treat, we will at first say a few words of the science itself and its methods.

It begins with the languages of men as they now are and are spoken by the different nations, tribes and races which inhabit and cover the earth's surface. It finds that they can at once be grouped into classes, by resemblances of two kinds, (1) by having words, common to several of them; and (2) by having modes of inflection and grammatical structure the same. Thus the French, the Italian, the Spanish, the Portuguese, have words in common, and principles of construction, which, while they are common to the language of that family, are peculiar to that family and characteristic of it.

But in the next place the Science of Language finds that the language of any one such family as French, Italian, &c. points to an earlier language, from which they have sprung in the course of ages, as daughters from a common mother. Such a language in reference to the French, is the Latin, and the Latin itself we have as a dead language. But when we go back to the time when the Latin was a spoken language, we find others sustaining the same relation to it that the French and Italian, do to one another now; and thus Latin, Greek and others point back to a parent language from which they are descended. Belonging to the same group as Latin and Greek, we have the Teutonic, the Celtic, the Sclavic in Europe, besides the Sanscrit and the early Persian or old Zend language of Asia.

Now suppose that every book and every sentence even of Latin had been swept out of existence so that not a single word of that old language could be found, *precisely as it was used by those who spoke it*, it would be possible from the comparison of these modern languages, to accomplish these very important results. 1. It would be possible, by comparison of them to find a large number of words which belonged to the parent language, though it might not be possible to find the precise form in which the word occurred there. Thus the French have *Dieu* for God, the Italian *Dio*, the Spanish *Dios*. From this it would be partly manifest that the Latins had some word from which this name of the Supreme Being had been derived, although it might not be possible to say that it had precisely the form *Deus*. 2. In the second place it would be possible from the words which we could thus ascertain that the Latins had and used, to derive a good deal of information in regard to their opinions, mode of life, and state of civilization. If they had a name for God, we might infer that they knew of and believed in such a Being. If they had a name for plow, we might infer that they knew something of agriculture.

Now by pursuing this method, the students of the Science of Language have found that at a very early day there was a nation, family or tribe that lived somewhere in the highlands of Asia, up in that high region where the Euphrates and the Indus take their rise—up where, in fact, all tradition, as well as the Scripture account, concur in placing the first abode of man. It is probable that no one word spoken by this early people can now be found in the exact form in which they used it. But words with different forms, having, however, the same root and signification, have been found in these various languages which sprang up after the breaking up and dispersion of this early people, sufficient to show us much of what was their language, and through their language what were their opinions, and what was their mode of life, and what the state of their civilization.

But these writers all concur in thinking that the abode of this primitive family must have been more than six or eight thousand years ago; the argument is cumulative in its nature, and depends upon a great variety of separate facts and incidents, which we do not care here to discuss, either for the purpose of refutation or

affirmation. Manifestly the time has not yet come for a final opinion on the subject. We may, however, be permitted to say that after having carefully considered the matter and scanned it, as we believe, in all its directions and bearings, we are of the opinion that, if the utmost claimed be conceded, it will require of us nothing more than that we abandon the chronology hitherto held concerning the patriarchal age, and treat the declarations that Adam for example "lived one hundred and thirty years and begat a son," as not intended to denote the time when the event occurred, or, if intended to denote the time at all, the words must be understood in some sense different from that which we have been accustomed to ascribe to them. Twice in the history of opinions we have been obliged to make a similar change in our mode of interpreting the language of Holy Scripture. The *first* time was when it was ascertained that the earth was a revolving globe rather than a flat stationary mass. The *second* was when it was proved that the earth itself has existed more than six thousand years, and had existed more than six times twenty-four hours before man began to live on its surface. We may soon be called upon to make another change. There are difficulties in the narration itself that urge us in this direction. Thus the Duke of Argyle, after fixing the foundation of the Egyptian Monarchy at seven hundred years before the time of Abraham's visit, which "according to Usher's Chronology would be some four hundred years before the flood," adds:

"It is not possible to suppose that some four hundred and fifty years before the foundation of the Egyptian Monarchy is a period long enough to account even for the few facts which are implied in the narrative itself respecting the dispersion and geographical distribution of mankind. And to these facts must be added others existing on evidence which is still historical." (Pp. 89, 90.)

On a subsequent page he adds:

"The evidence for a higher antiquity of Man is derived from countries in comparatively close proximity with those which under any possible supposition as to the area of a Deluge, must have been submerged. On the other hand, we have seen how utterly uncertain and how enormously different are the chronologies which profess to be founded on the Pentateuch. They all involve suppositions as to the principle of interpretation and as to the import of

words descriptive of descent, which are in the highest degree doubtful, and which it is evident cannot be applied consistently throughout. Thus when we read of Canaan, (Gen. x. 15–18,) the grandson of Noah, that he begat Sidon, his first-born, and Heth, we seem to have the names of individual men; but when it is immediately added that he also begat the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, &c., &c., it is clear that we are dealing not with single generations, but with a condensed abstract of the origin and growth of tribes. No definite information is given in such abstracts as to the lapse of time. The chronology of changes, not specially included in the narrative, can only be gathered from the general character of the events described. And that general character is such as fully to corroborate the evidence we have from other sources, that long before the call of Abraham, that is to say, long before the twentieth century B. C., the Human Race had been increasing and multiplying on the earth from such ancient days, that in many regions, far removed from the centre of their dispersion, great nations had arisen, powerful and civilized governments had been established." (Pp. 93–95.)

But leaving the question of chronology aside for the present, let us come to another point. These philological investigations, by the method we have described, lift the vail from two of the darkest problems in known history, concerning the early condition of man, and his religious history.

Some four or five hundred words have been identified as roots that must have belonged to this primitive language, and they disclose the state of society and mode of life of those early, and so far as we know and can know, these *first* inhabitants of the earth. Says Max Müller:

"It can be proved by evidence of language, that before Asia separated, the Aryans"—the name by which he designated these early inhabitants—"led the life of agricultural nomads—a life such as Tacitus describes as that of the ancient Germans. They knew the arts of plowing, of making roads, of building ships, of weaving, of sewing, of erecting houses; they had counted at least as far as one hundred. They had domesticated the most important animals—the cow, the horse, the sheep, and the dog; they were acquainted with the most useful metals, and armed with iron hatchets, whether for peaceful or warlike purposes; they had

recognized the bonds of blood and the bonds of marriage; they followed their leaders and kings, and the distinction between right and wrong was fixed by laws and customs. They were impressed with the idea of a Supreme Being, and they invoked it by various names." *Science of Language, 1st Series, pp.* 235–6.

Whitney, in his Lectures on Language and the Study of Language, says:

"By this kind of research then it is found that the primitive tribe which spake the mother tongue of the Indo-European family, was not nomadic alone, but had settled habitations, even towers and fortified places, and addicted itself in part to the cultivation of the earth. It possessed our chief domestic animals—the horse, the ox, the sheep, the goat, the swine, besides the dog; the bear and the wolf, were foes that ravaged its flocks; the mouse and the fly were already its domestic pests. The region it inhabited was a varied one, not bordering on the ocean. The season whose name has been the most persistent is winter. Barley and perhaps also wheat was raised for food, and converted into meal. Mead was prepared from honey as a cheering and inebriating drink. The use of certain metals was known; whether iron was one of them admits of question. The art of weaving was practiced; wool, hemp, and possibly flax, being the materials employed. Of other branches of domestic industry little that is definite can be said; but those already mentioned imply a variety of others as co-ordinate or auxiliary to them. The weapons of offense and defense were those which are usual among primitive people, the sword, spear, bow, and shield. Boats were manufactured and moved by oars. Of extended and elaborate political organizations, no traces are discoverable; the people were doubtless a congeries of petty tribes, under chiefs and leaders, other than kings, and with the institutions of a patriarchal cast, among which a reduction to servitude of prisoners taken in war, appears not to have been wanting. The structure and relations of the family are more clearly seen—names of its members, even to the second and third degrees of consanguinity and affinity were already fixed, and were significant of affectionate regard and trustful interdependence; that woman was looked down upon as a being inferior in capacity and dignity to man, we find no indication, whatever. The art of enumeration was wound up to a hundred. There is no general Indo-

European word for 'thousand.' Some of the stars were noticed and named; the Moon was the chief measurer of time; the religion was polytheistic—a worship of the personified powers of nature. Its rites whatever they were, were practiced without the aid of a priesthood." Pp. 207, 208.

We have cited this passage at length, for its confirmation of the one just cited from Max Müller. But it must be borne in mind that while in general confirmatory of it, it describes this early family of men, as it appears at a period of its history somewhat later than that described by Müller. This author speaks of it before its religion had passed into polytheism, and before the time when prisoners taken in war were condemned to slavery—possibly before war itself had become a practice among men.

But in these testimonies we have proof of a very different condition among the early inhabitants of the earth,—the *earliest* that we know anything about—from that which the geologists and the friends of the development theory advocate. We say the "*earliest* times;" for whatever may have been the date of the occupation of Europe by those whose ancient remains we find there, they must have been later than this early habitation in Asia. And the inference to be drawn from all the facts and testimonies in the cases is that which the Duke of Argyle has drawn with such irresistible force in the book already named—that man has departed from his original condition in *both* directions in regard to civilization—that is, while the more advanced nations have gone in one direction—the direction of advance and improvement, the others—those whom we now find in the lowest conditions, have departed in the other direction, and descended into the depths of ignorance, barbarism and savagery: that in fact the savage of this nineteenth century is as unlike and as much below his early progenitors, as the most advanced of the modern civilized nations are above what they were. They were in a sense children—children in purity, simplicity, guilelessness, in imagination and trustful faith. We have become worse in intellect—cautious, distrustful, and in many respects at least less morally pure. The savages have become less intelligent, and more revengeful, degraded, beastly. Both are stronger in passions, in self-will, in devotion to the affairs of this world, and the enjoyments and occupations of the hour. And

as there can be no doubt, that the savages whom we now find in Australia and other parts most remote from their Asiatic home, are degenerate descendants of those worshipers of the one true God, so there can be no doubt, we think, that the first savage inhabitants of Europe, of which the geologists treat, were also climatic beings who had emigrated from the same central home.

We regard this testimony to the early intelligence, purity and civilization of men, as of the utmost importance, and should be glad to accumulate proof, and expatiate upon it, if our time and space would admit. The question of the time when they lived we regard as comparatively unimportant, but the *condition* in which they lived, whether they were men or monkeys—whether they were intelligent and civilized, or savage and beastly, is of inexpressible importance. It interposes a barrier to one of the most dangerous and seductive forms of the infidelity of our age, which cannot be overcome or evaded. Civilized man of this nineteenth century may or may not be an improvement upon the first man. But the savage is a degradation from, and not a perpetuation of this early type of humanity.

We come then to the religious history of man, for which this discussion may serve as an introduction.

In the most early period, man was a believer in a worship of one God, without priesthood or animal sacrifice.

It is a grave and most important inquiry, how came the knowledge of this one God? What name did those primitive worshipers call Him by? The last question we can answer better than the former. Müller came to the conclusion, which, as to the fact, we suppose, cannot be doubted, though we dissent from his theory of it, that that word was synonymous with our word "*dawn.*" It is the root from which the Zeus, of the Greek, the Jupiter (Jovis pater) of the Latins and all the names of deity or divinity, in all languages, have been derived. Hence Müller thinks that men at first worshiped the Dawn and the rising Sun, and the Sun in various conditions, and the sky and the heavenly bodies. But here we dissent from his theory.

It is yet a disputed point. What parts of speech were the first words used by men? Some say adjectives, others say verbs, and others still say nouns; and Müller's theory is based on the assump-

tion that they were nouns. But our opinion is that they were not written verbs, nouns or adjectives exclusively, but all three together or indiscriminately; thus, as now in China, the semi-sound or word was either one or the other of the three, as occasion and use required. But soon, in all the Indo-European languages at least, this root took different forms, as it was rendered, to serve either of the three functions, as snow (noun), snowy (adjective), snows (verb).

Hence, the word "dawn," when first used, could not have been exclusively a noun. On the contrary, it is most likely to have been an impersonal verb, like our "it rains," "it snows." Hence the expression, "it dawns." Did they worship the dawning or *it?* IT, which denoted that as yet unannounced Being, whose coming was light, and whose approach was heralded by the brightness in the East? Indeed the Sun came after a while, and one of the earliest phases of idolatry and polytheism was the worship of the Sun. But as Müller himself says: "Beyond the Dawn, however, another infinite power was expected, for which neither the language of the Vedic Rishis, nor that of any other poets or prophets, had yet suggested a fitting name." (*Science of Language, 2d Series, p.* 536.) To these early inhabitants of the Earth, in their child-like simplicity, all things spoke of the unknown and unconceived IT, which created all things, which came in the dawn, moved in the clouds and in the wind, spoke in the thunder, and filled the Earth with whatever is bountiful, grand or useful—they saw the phenomena of Nature; but knew nothing of the causes and laws of those phenomena. But true to nature, they supposed that wherever there was motion there was something that moved—change implied a changing power; dawning light implied a Light that dawned—they were no materialists—they could not believe that mere matter accounted for all they saw in nature. Hence, they saw God in everything, and worshiped him everywhere.

But now we pass to consider another phase of men's religious history. The adjectives that had at first been used as adjectives to denote attributes of God, came to be abstract nouns, and the language in which they had been so used was forgotten. Doubtless before this there had been in the glowing dreams of pure theology some confounding of God with the Sun—then with the stars and

other objects, and forms of nature. But it is a fact that the writings of Müller and other researches in the same field have made too obvious to admit of doubt that the names of the deities of the early mythologies and polytheisms, were, for the most part, if not exclusively, derived from adjectives, and used as abstract nouns at first; thus, as if in English, we say God is omnipotent, we make omnipotent into omnipotence, and worship omnipotence as a God—one of our deities. So we may say, God is almighty, and then when our language shall have become obsolete, and a race less spiritually inclined, or less elevated in intellect than we are, come to speak it in its secondary form, they will worship "almightiness" as a god.

Here then we have the origin and explanation of polytheism. It implies a pervading monotheism. It implies a lapse of time. It implies a change in language, as from the Latin of the age of the Cæsars, to the Italian or French of to-day—the Saxon of Alfred's time to the English of King James. It implies a decline in intelligence—a decline in religious instincts. It shows that man had become worldly, sensual, unbelieving, and yet superstitious—not willing to keep the knowledge of the true God in mind, and not quite willing or able to live and die without something that he could call God.

These are their theories of an origin of words, (mentioned among those who do not accept a Bible account,) on purely scientific grounds. It is with them that we have to deal in this Article. One theory is that words at first were exclamations, sometimes called the *pooh-pooh* theory. Another is that they were imitations of natural sounds—called also the *bow-wow* theory, and another that words are purely arbitrary signs called also the *ding-dong* theory. Now we believe that each of these is true in a measure—that primitive man without words or language, *if there ever was such a being*—would, on hearing any sound, make an effort to imitate that sound, and the sound which he would make would become the name of the object.—In sight of any thing in motion he would likely make a motion and probably a sound such as the motion itself would excite. Max Müller, however, holds that the first words "express a general and not an individual idea." (*Science of Language*, 1*st Series*, *p.* 370.) These ideas, therefore, must have been innate, and man had the "instinctive faculty for giving

articulate expression to the rational conception of his mind"—this is the statement of the "*ding-dong*" theory.

But in whatever way these words may have originated they were at first either adjectives, nouns or verbs, or most likely all three indiscriminately—the adjectives and the verbs soon became abstract nouns—the abstractions became objectified—the objects were personified—the persons defined, and for a ONE being moving, acting in, and animating all things—"in whom we live and move and have our being,"—we have many gods—one for each kind of action, each class of phenomena—as in the Greek and Roman theology. And this theory is confirmed by the fact that the names thus given to these deities were at first, and in their roots, the adjectives that denoted the qualities—or the verbs that denoted the actions of visible material things. But for Him, the Unseen, and Everywhere present, there was no name. Even the word Dawn was used to denote Him that dawned upon us in the glad light of returning day.

There were naturally enough many words to denote dawn in that early language, and from each of these words have been derived. Says Müller:

"The dawn is really one of the richest sources of Aryan mythology, and another class of legends embodying the strife between winter and summer, the return of spring, the revival of nature, is in most languages but a reflection and amplification of the more ancient stories, telling of the strife between night and day, the return of the morn, the revival of the whole world." (Vol. II. p. 93.) If the people of antiquity called these eternal lights of heaven their gods, their bright ones—"*deva*,"—whence *deus*, God) the dawn was the first born among all the gods. "Protogenia—dearest to man, and always young and fresh." (p. 95.) "We cannot realize this sentiment with which the age of antiquity dwelt on these sights of nature. To us, all is law, order, necessity. We calculate the refractory power of the atmosphere, we measure the possible length of the dawn in every climate, and the rising of the sun is to us no greater surprise than the birth of a child. But if we could believe again, that there was in the sun a being like our own, that in the dawn there was a soul open to human sympathy—if we could bring ourselves to look for a moment upon these

powers as personal, free and adorable, how different would be our feelings at the blush of day! The Titanic assurance with which we say the sun *must* rise, was unknown to the early worshipers of nature, or if they also began to feel the regularity with which the sun and the other stars perform their daily labor they still thought of free beings kept in temporary servitude, chained for a time and bound to obey a higher will, but sure to rise, like Herakles, to a higher glory at the end of their labors." (P. 96.)

But we must never forget what we have once said in the words of Müller himself, and what we now repeat, lest it be forgotten or overlooked, that "Beyond the Dawn, however, another INFINITE POWER was suspected, for which the language of none of their poets or prophets had yet suggested a name." Their expression was "IT dawns," but the IT was an unknown "Infinite Power," behind the dawning, and the growth, and clearly, the living and moving that make up the phenomena of life and nature, whom through His works and *in* His works—and all nature was His work—they served, and before whom in reverent adoration they bowed to worship.

But we must pass to the next stage—Mythology.

"Mythology," says Müller, "is a disease of language." It consists in inventing a story to explain the meaning of a word, whose meaning is unknown. We remember an incident that will perhaps best explain what we mean. Some years ago, we happened to be listening to a conversation on the subject of the tariff, between two politicians. Being a little puzzled in our efforts to understand them, we asked one of them what he supposed a Tariff to be. Why, says he, it is something that keeps foreign products out of our market and thus encourages domestic industry. Very well, said we, this may be what it *does*, but we asked what it *is*. He said he did not really know himself. He had often thought of it and tried to imagine what it could be. He supposed it must be something in the nature of a fleet or gunboat at any rate, stationed out in the harbor to prevent vessels loaded with commodities of foreign manufacture from coming into port. Now here was a myth, and this was mythology; the politician knew what a Tariff was said *to do*, but not knowing what it *was*, he invented an idea, and so a story or myth, in which he was guided and limited only by the nature of the act that was ascribed to that which the, to him, unintelligible name, denoted.

Now as Müller has shown, and as is now universally acknowledged we believe, all or nearly all mythology originated in this way. The names of mythological beings are found for the most part to have come down from an age and a language that had been in part at least forgotten before the myth was invented. The story of Endymion is an example. We condense it from Müller. According to the myth,—

"Endymion is the son of Zeus and Kalyke, but he is also the son of Æthlios, a king of Elis, who is himself called a son of Zeus, whom Endymion is said to have succeeded as king of Elis. . . But who was Endymion? It is one of the many names of the sun; but with special reference to the setting or dying sun. . . . Endymion, sinking into eternal sleep after a life of but one day, was the setting sun, and Kalyke, into whose lap he sunk, was but another name for night—that which was covered by darkness. Selene also (the moon) watched Endymion. In ancient practical proverbial language people said, "Selene loves and watches Endymion," instead of "it is getting late." "Selene embraces Endymion," instead of "the sun is setting and the moon rising." "Selene kisses Endymion into sleep," instead of "it is night." "These expressions remained long after their meaning had ceased to be understood; and as the human mind is generally as anxious for a reason as ready to invent one, a story arose by common consent and without any personal effort, that Endymion must have been a young lad loved by a young lady, Selene: and if children were anxious to know still more, there would always be a grandmother happy to tell them that the young Endymion was the son of Protogenia—she half meaning and half not meaning by that name the dawn who gave birth to the sun: or of Kalyke, the dark and cowering night. This name once touched would set many chords to vibrating there, as four different reasons might be given (as they were really given by ancient poets,) why Endymion fell into this everlasting sleep. . . . So that Endymion grew at last into a type no longer of the setting sun, but of a handsome boy beloved of a chaste maiden, and therefore a most likely name for a young prince." (Vol. II. pp. 78–83.)

Most of the names of the mythological persons in the Greek and Roman mythologies, as in fact in all animal mythologies, are derived from words and roots in the earlier language, which how-

ever had ceased to be used as common words, and had thus lost their meaning for the people in the time when the myth ceased. We have illustrations of this from nearly every word introduced into our language from Latin or Greek. To the new English scholar who knows nothing of Greek, the word "telegraph," for example, signifies nothing until he is told that it means an instrument for writing at a distance. But to one who understands Greek the meaning is obvious from its etymology. So to one who spoke the early Aryan language, or even the Sanscrit of the Vedic age, Endymion meant the setting sun. But to a Greek in the time of Homer even it was only a proper noun—a word that denoted something, and therefore a person who could be "loved," "kissed," and "go to sleep."

It is certainly possible, nay more it must be *a priori* probable, that not all myths can be explained in this way, and to this extent. But here we have the ground principle that presides over and accounts for their origin. It is in one word—ignorance, attempting to explain by fancy and imagination, and without observation and investigation, what it does not understand. It is natural to man. It arose early in his career. It is not ended yet. The natural philosopher, who speaks of "a principle of life," of "heat," of "light," of "electricity," as realities that cause and explain the phenomena of the material world around us, is mythologizing. He speaks of that of which he really knows nothing. And when he attempts, as materialists of our day do attempt, to explain the origin and creation of living things on the earth by means of such entities as these, he is doing precisely what the early inventors of polytheism and mythology did years ago in the early dawn of human existence.

If now polytheism arose, as we have seen, from a taking of attributes for separate divinities, so mythology arose from taking poetry for prose, and treating the imagery of the poem as though it was the literal statement of fact that constitutes the latter. And in this way mythology implies a decline or degeneracy in the intellectual status or condition of those with whom the mythology originated no less than polytheism; the very fact that such absurd stories as the myths, for the most part were believed, being proof enough of the low state of mental culture. It shows plainly the contrast between them and the people of our age. But

from the nature of the case the polytheism must have preceded the mythology, and so likewise monotheism must have preceded the polytheism. Hence as there was a decline in the natural intelligence in man, before polytheism could have replaced the early belief in one God, so there must have been a further decline before men could have become so insensible to poetic diction, and so incapable of appreciating it as the origin and belief in the stories of the mythological age implies. And we in our age having come to regard these stories as absurd and incredible, so also by the advance of science and the fuller development of the argument from nature, we shall doubtless come to see that as there is no argument there in favor of a plurality of gods, so there is abundant proof of the existence of ONE who was before the dawn, and is manifest in all of nature. We see what was to those early worshipers of Asia, perhaps, as mere statement, must become to us an assured conviction, not now testing our own feelings, but accepted as the result of the clearest analysis and the most cogent demonstration.

We may as well be plain about the matter, and lay aside all verbiage and the subterfuge of unintelligible language. Natural Religion affords no proof or support to polytheism. We can then have but three other possible suppositions.

1. That of the materialist, who denying the existence of mind and of God, must of course hold that matter *thinks* and *creates* itself; for certainly thought, and something which all agree in calling creation do take place, and if matter is the only substance that exists, matter thinks and creates—creates itself.

2. We may have the supposition of the pantheist, that thought and things thought of are one and the same. Then we have thinking with nothing that thinks, motion without a mover.

3. Or, thirdly, we may have a belief in One Spiritual Being, Who thinks, creates, superintends, guides and controls all things. The first and second involve a contradiction in terms, and are therefore absurd and impossible. The last is tenable, nay, inevitable, but alas! for man, it involves the idea of restraint, of accountability, a life to come and a future judgment. Hence the difficulty. Heaven and Earth ransacked for arguments and motives for not accepting the Bible and Church as means of instruction, sources of comfort and strength, and guides to life and blessedness.

In our Article we have thought best to pursue our subject

from the purely scientific standpoint, making no use of Scripture authority or Scripture accounts, employing only what the students of Natural Science find in their way.

Nor have we attempted a review of the Books named at the head of our Article. We would therefore say in conclusion, that the first named, the work of Max Müller, together with his two Volumes or Series of Lectures on the Science of Language, will be found to contain the best exposition of the *theory* of myths; the work of Mr. Cox is an admirable little Manual, full of the *explanations* of myths; while the work of the Duke of Argyll is an exceedingly able and candid review of the present state of knowledge and controversy on the subject of which it treats.

ART. IV.—MATTHEW PARKER.

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

THE object of this paper is not to enter on the question of Archbishop Parker's consecration, under any of its aspects, nor yet to consider his public life and its relations; but simply to illustrate his private character, and that, chiefly, from his own memoranda and correspondence.

Any man in public life at such a period as that in which Parker lived, is more than usually liable to be misjudged. When systems and schools of thought are in active collision, when, amid difficulties and resistances of no ordinary magnitude, great foundations are to be laid, when without are fightings and within are fears, those whom Providence places in prominent positions, and on whom responsibilities of action are laid, can be known, as to their private characters, by only a very few. And even what is called the calmer judgment of posterity rarely penetrates the dusty veil which obscures the vision, rarely closes its ear to the clang and clamor which shut out the greater voice of truth.

In common with all men occupying positions similar to his, Parker has suffered from the operation of these causes. Placed at the head of ecclesiastical affairs at the beginning of the reign of

such a sovereign as Elizabeth; charged with the duty of relaying foundations once begun, and once, at least, rudely upturned; with one powerful opposing party looking ecclesiastically to Rome, and politically to Scotland; with another yearning towards Geneva, and not ashamed to accept at home the political leadership of such a man as Leicester; with open enemies and secret foes on every side; and all this at a period when no party or individual professed or even held what we mean by religious toleration, he must have trod on somebody's toes at every turn and step; he must have been called stern and severe by those against whom he put in execution the law of the realm; those who would have called any man stern and severe unless he had left them to follow out unchecked, the dictates of their own self-will.

Besides, the greatest possible of biographical infelicities,—in common to be sure with many other people—has befallen Parker. He has been written about by Bishop Burnet and Daniel Neale. The former seems always to have had the feeling that he was, somehow, honored when others were depressed; and hence, even when motives of private malice (in the case of his contemporaries ever active and abundant) failed him, he was always furnished with a sufficient motive for general malignity and disparagement. The latter was a double-dyed partisan, narrower even than his principles would necessarily make him, and, to all appearance, considering the most reckless mendacity, provided only it was exercised in behalf of the Puritan faction, as a cardinal virtue.

It is pleasant to turn away for a while, not only from such people, but also from the dust and noise and confusion of ordinary history, and to come within doors from the outer world. We are not entirely separated by so doing, from that outer world. We hear the roar, we feel the impulse of its onward movement. But we are with those who shared, and it may be guided, the movement, in withdrawn-places and "loopholes of retreat," where we get at their inner thoughts, plans and purposes. If it is ever worth while to know anything about historical characters, it is worth while sometimes to seek to know them thus.

In the Parker society's volume of Archbishop Parker's correspondence,—the volume with which we have principally to do,—there is an appendix, of but four octavo pages, containing some autobiographical notes and data, with a few additions by another

hand. Small as it is, it is still of the greatest value, and, as we shall have occasion to see, sometimes very touching in its details.

From this it appears, that born in August, 1504, Parker went to Cambridge in 1522, was made Bachelor of Arts in 1525, ordained Deacon and Priest in 1527, elected Fellow of Corpus Christi College in the same year, and that with this College he continued connected as Fellow or Master,—to which latter office he was elected in 1544,—until the beginning of Mary's reign, in 1553, when he resigned his Mastership "under contract." This long-continued connection with his College, from 1522 to 1553, gives us, we may observe in passing, the reason why the Archbishop gave to it that collection of manuscripts, among which is one containing the account of his consecration.

The first letters in the volume of correspondence are dated in 1534, when he had been Fellow of Corpus Christi a little more than seven years. How he loved the quiet and retirement of a scholar's life, how unwillingly he suffered himself to be dragged away from it to public positions and responsibilities, how he ever and anon tried to steal back, for a few moments, to it or something like it, how his heart yearned towards the home of his youth and manhood, so that he would rather have his old College "with a living of twenty nobles by the year at the most, than to dwell in the Deanery of Lincoln, which is two hundred at the least," all these things waken true sympathy for a man who had been forced, by providential circumstances and the acts of others, to forego and deny all natural tastes, to abandon the plan of life which he had sketched for himself, and to take a position in which, as is ever the case in the Episcopate, all failures are sure to be laid upon his shoulders, and all successes to be claimed by others.

The earlier letters are neither very important nor very interesting. Some of them relate to Parker's appointment as chaplain, first to Anne Boleyn, and then to Henry VIII. Others are business letters. Then there is a long correspondence between Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and Parker, then Vice Chancellor of his University, beginning with notice of some hitch about a provision for "decayed cooks," and then going on tediously enough, concerning a tragedy, which the undergraduates of Christ's Church had played, and about which one, Mr. Scot, had gone gossiping to Gardiner, and had thereby come to the grief which often

befalls gossips. There are, however, several letters, which give us glimpses of Parker's character, and show the estimation in which he was held.

Thomas Cromwell writes to him, "of the honest report of his learning in holy letters, and uncorrupt judgment in the same." Skip, afterwards Bishop of Hereford, speaks of his "old and busy diligence in work," and although there is meant apparently to be a little sneer in the letter, still it exhibits qualities in Parker which were, in his later life, strangely marked. Bishop Ridley says, in ordering him to preach at St. Paul's Cross in 1551—a duty which Parker's modesty and hatred of field days led him to decline as long as he could:—

"I may have, if I would call without any choice, enow, but in some, alas! I desire more learning, in some a better judgment, in some more virtue and godly consecration, in some more soberness and discretion. And he in whom all these do concur shall not do well to refuse (in my judgment) to serve God in that place; of the which number. . . . . I take you to be."

There is one letter of Parker himself, written probably in 1539, which is reassuring, because it adds a fresh illustration to the often illustrated assertion of Solomon, "The thing that hath been it is that which shall be; and there is no new thing under the sun." It must be remembered that 1539 was a ticklish year in England. Henry had taken offence at Cranmer, because he could not give his consent in Parliament to the King's having "all the monasteries to his own use," and this, for the time, threw power into the hands of that prince of intriguers, Stephen Gardiner. Anabaptist and other extravagancies, too, had produced a narcotic in the minds of men. Under these circumstances the Statute of the Six Articles—the six stringed whip—was passed, while, both before and after its passage, the ears and eyes of the Mediævalists were opened for sights and sounds of portent, as widely as those of Exeter Hall are in our day in the opposite direction; the air was snuffed as keenly for scents of anti-papal heresy, as bloodhounds snuff it for the scent of human flesh.

At Easter of this year, Parker preached either at Stoke or the neighboring town of Clare. He had been made Dean of Stoke-Clare in 1535. Sundry inhabitants of Clare-town, headed by one Mr. Colt, delated him to Lord Chancellor Audley as having denounced the Easter morning procession in the church, as a

"mere pageant or interlude," asserted that the Cross of our Lord was no holier than those of the two thieves, and declared, (it is amusing to see how regularly in such cases they dragged in something calculated to rouse the king's anger on his own behalf,) that the king "with the money that he gathered of the commons, bought peace with other realms."

As in most such cases, there was very little bread to an intolerable quantity of sack in all this. Parker replied that what he said about the Easter procession was, that unless they accompanied it with meditations on their faith in Him who died for their sins, and rose again for their justification, and with purpose of rising with Him to a new life, it would be a vain pageant; that what he said of the Cross was, that "to forget the mystery of Christ's Cross, and fall to the worshiping of the tree of His Cross, was a superstitious worship;" and as to the king he had urged his hearers to consider what a boon and benefit peace was, that the King could not maintain them in it "against foreign realms without charges and expense," and that, therefore, they ought "with good and ready wills to pay their taxes."

One can imagine the ponderous solemnity and oracular gravity, with which Mr. Colt and his parochial compeers delivered themselves of their utterances. But is the picture entirely without a parallel now? Can none of our readers recall some such instance within the range of their own experience?

The first series, so to speak, of letters ends in 1552, and then follows a gap in the correspondence till 1558. Letter writing could have hardly been much in vogue during the reign of Mary.

At the time of Mary's accession, Parker, besides the mastership of his college, held a rectory, the deanery of Lincoln, and a prebend in Ely Cathedral, as well as at Lincoln. His mastership he resigned under constraint, in 1553. Of his other preferments he was deprived in 1554, and then went into retirement. He did not fly to the continent as many others did, but staid quietly in England; thus braving a danger which others avoided by flight. For the flight, no fault can reasonably be found with them. It was their right. But those of them are blameworthy, worthy of contemptuous and shameful condemnation, who having put themselves out of harm's way on the Continent, returned in Elizabeth's reign,

and began to vilify and denounce better and braver men than themselves as cowardly, and only half reformed. Parker is found neither among the fugitives, nor yet among those who fell in with the spiritually conceited faction, which thus returned to lay the foundations of lasting difficulty.

The gap between 1552 and 1588 is filled in a general but touching way by some brief passages in the Archbishop's memoranda, parts of which we transcribe, believing they will be new to many of our readers.

After May 21st, 1554, he says:

"After this I lived as a private individual, so happy before God in my conscience, and so far from being either ashamed or dejected, that the most sweet leisure for study to which the good providence of God recalled me yielded me much greater and more solid enjoyments, than my former busy and dangerous kind of life had ever afforded me. What shall befall me hereafter, I know not; but to God, who cares for all men, who will one day reveal the secrets of the heart, I commit myself wholly, and my good and virtuous wife with my two very dear children."

And so, in several other years, he records his contentment, constancy, and happiness, in his retirement and his studies. Among other things, he mentions the completion of "a metrical version of the Psalter into the vulgar tongue," and "a defense of the marriage of priests against Thomas Martin."

One cannot but be struck with his reticence, both in memoranda and correspondence. Where there was the fairest possible opportunity—apart from the temptation of a modern conventional address—for self-declaration and assertion, he modestly puts it all aside. He speaks once of "passing those hard years of Mary's reign in obscurity;" once he says, "flying in a night from such as sought me to my peril, I fell off my horse so dangerously that I shall never recover it;" and in the sketch of his life appended to his "Antiquities," we are told that "humili conditione, contentus, infra domesticos parietes cujusdam sui amici abditus, vitam egenam atque inopem produxit." Obscurity, poverty, actual danger of life appear, surely, as no great ground for contentment or happiness. And the man who could extract the latter from the former, must have possessed the secret of that true Christian alchemy, which transmutes seeming evil into real good.

Queen Mary died, Nov. 17th, 1558; "her death," says Hey-

lin, "accompanied within a few hours after by that of the Lord Cardinal Legate; ushered in by the decease of Penefere, alias Wharton, Bishop of Hereferd, and Holyman, the new Bishop of Bristow, and Glyn, of Bangor; and followed, within two or three months after, by Hopton, Bishop of Norwich, and Brooks of Gloucester; as if it had been necessary, in point of state, that so great a Princess should not die without some of her Bishops going before, and some coming after."

Fuller speaks of nine bishops who died at this time, and whom he calls "the death-guard of Queen Mary." By the death of Cardinal Pole the Archiepiscopal See became vacant, and the first letter which follows the six years' gap, is occasioned by this vacancy, and opens the course of correspondence and of action which ended, after more than a year's delay, in Parker's consecration to the Archbishopric. The letters bring out the private history of the whole matter in a very interesting way; and supplement, most satisfactorily, the public history.

First comes a letter from Sir Nicholas Bacon (afterwards Lord Keeper,) addressed to Parker, still in his seclusion, and summoning him, " with as convenient speed as may be, to London, "for certain matters touching yourself, which I trust shall turn to your good." If Sir Nicholas is not in London, when he comes he is "to repair to Sir William Cecil [Lord Burleigh afterwards], the Queen's Secretary." This letter is dated Dec. 9th, 1558. Somewhere between that date and Dec. 20th, Parker replies, that he cannot now come to London by reason of his quartan ague; begs that nothing may be laid on him "above the reach of his ability;" would fain wear out the rest of his life in a private state; would like the "revenue of some prebend," so that he might preach "God's reverend word amongst the simple strayed sheep of God's fold, in poor, destitute parishes and cures;" of all places in England would prefer the University of Cambridge; and had rather have Benet [Corpus Christi] College than anything else. How touchingly he concludes his appeal!

"'In conclusion, at the reverence of God, I pray you, either help that I be quite forgotten, or else so appointed, that I be not entangled now of new with the concerns of the world, in any respect of public state or living.' On the 20th, he promised to meet Sir Nicholas at Bingeny* or New Market."

Whether or not the meeting took place does not appear. On

* Bingavenny House in London.

the 30th Sir William Cecil communicates the Queen's order for him to come forthwith to London. And this order is followed on the 4th of Jan., 1559,* by a similar communication from Bacon. The double royal command brought Parker to London, and now, if not before, he learned the preferment which was intended for him. How the intelligence affected him appears from a letter to Bacon, dated March 1st, 1559, from which we make the following extracts:

"Sir, your signification uttered to me at my first coming to you at London, concerning a certain office ye named to me, did hold me in such carefulness all my time of being there, with the recovering of a dull distemperance set in my head by the dregs of my quartane and as yet not remedied, whereby I had no disposition to my book, besides some other displeasant cogitations concerning the state of this time, made me too have so little joy of my being in London, as I never had less in my life; most glad when my back was turned thereunto. But to come nigher to my intent of writing, I shall pray to God ye bestow that office well; ye shall need care the less for the residue. God grant it chanceth neither one arrogant man, neither one faint-hearted man, nor one covetous man. The first shall both sit in his own light, and shall discourage his fellows to join with him in unity of doctrine, which must be their whole strength. . . . The second man should be too weak to commune with the adversaries, who would be the stouter upon his pusillanimity. The third man not worth his bread, profitable for no estate in any Xtian commonwealth to serve it rightly."

He thanks Bacon for his and Cecil's good will and favorable esteem, but deprecates the time which both are taking in the matter in hand, saying:

"I fear, in the end, I shall die like you both, and that your benevolence should by occasion of my obstinate untowardness jeopard me in prison: yet there shall I leave you a good heart, which I had rather suffer in a quiet conscience, than to be intruded into such room and occasion, wherein I should not be able to answer the charge to God nor to the world." The chief things to which he here alludes, come out quaintly in a later letter to Cecil.† "The truth is what with passing those hard years of Mary's reign in obscurity, without all conference or such manner of study as now might do me service, and what with my natural viciosity of overmuch shamefastness, I am so babished in myself, that I cannot rack up my heart and stomach to utter in talk with others, what (as I may say,) with my pen I can express indifferently without great difficulty. And, again, I am so well acquainted with strangers, both in their manner of utterance of their speech, and also in such foreign affairs, that I cannot win of myself any ways to satisfy my fancy in such kind of entertainment."

* New style is followed, all along, in the dates.

† Ascribed to 1563, but probably of much earlier date.

In short it was the timidity and shrinkingness of a humble man and retired scholar.

To return to the letter to Bacon. He goes on to urge his poverty:

"When I first came up to London, I had thirty pounds in my purse, not ten shillings more, whereof I have wasted a good part. And if I were placed, as some of my friends write to me, what would that do to begin or to furnish my household, &c.?"

Nor is this all; his health is in the way.

"I am in body hurt and decayed, *coram Deo non mentior*, that whatsoever my ability were, either of worldly furniture or inward quality, and though my heart would right fain serve my sovereign lady, the Queen's majesty, in more respects than of mine allegiance, not forgetting what words Her Grace's mother said to me of her, not six days before her apprehension, yet this, my painful infirmity will not suffer it in all manner servings..... I am fain sometimes to be idle, when I would be occupied, and also to keep my bed, when my heart is not sick."

So he begs to be passed by; to be left in some quiet place; not compelled to attend convocations; and yet willing to be of use to Cecil and to come to London and the Court, if his

"Service could be any ways acceptable, and were agreeable to the proportion of his capacity." It is not that he wishes for an easy life; "think not, I pray your honor, that I seek mine private gain, or my idle ease. Put me where ye will else; and if, as far as my power of knowledge and of health of body will extend, I do not apply myself to discharge my duty, let me be thrust out again like a thief."

So matters rest for a while, Parker being at Cambridge till May 17th, when Bacon writes him that it is determined to put the Archbishopric upon him, in view of which he advises him

"To commit to the judgment of his friends his ability and disability to serve where he may be called," adding, "If I knew a man to whom the description made in the beginning of your letter might be more justly referred than to yourself, I would prefer him before you; but knowing none so meek, indeed I take it to be my duty to prefer you before all others, and the rather also, because otherwise I should not follow the advice of your own letter."

This is followed on the 19th by a joint summons from Bacon and Cecil, to "repair up" forthwith to Court; and, Parker, not heeding the order, it is repeated on the 28th, and he is ordered to come

with all speed possible." As a last resort, the persecuted man appeals to the Queen in a letter written some time in June, in which, acknowledging his duty to her and his obligations to her mother, he still pathetically begs to be relieved from the load about to be laid on him.

"Calling to examination my great unworthiness for so high a function, which mine disability, I might allege at length, in particularity, but for molesting your Grace's most weighty affairs, I am bold, then, by my writing, to approach to your high estate reverently on my knees, beseeching your Honor to discharge me of that so high and chargeable an office, which doth require a man of much more wit, learning, virtue and experience, than I see and perfectly know can be performed of me, worthily to occupy it to God's pleasure, to your Grace's honor, and to the wealth of your loving subjects, beside many other imperfections in me, as well for temporal ability for the furnishing thereof as were seemly to the honor of the realm, as also of infirmity of body, which will not suffer me to attend on so difficult a cure, to the discharge thereof in any reasonable expectation."

There is no cant, or speaking for effect, in all this. It is a genuine *nolo episcopari.* Indeed, it must have been believed that, he who did not fly from the dangers of Mary's reign, was now meditating flight from the kingdom to avoid the Episcopate; for Bacon tells Parker that some one had "sued for a *ne exeat regnum*" against him, "which," he adds, "at my return to London he shall have." There could be but one end to all this. The possibility of his being put in prison for his untowardness had, obviously, been hinted to him; and now he is absolutely restrained from leaving the realm,—his wooing to the Episcopate "with Amazonian charms." But the wooing is effectual; and the letter which follows the announcement of the *ne exeat* is signed by Parker, Aug. 8th, as Elect of Canterbury; his election having taken place on the 1st of that month. Our readers may think that we have made a long story of what might have been stated in a few words. But our object is, as we said in the beginning, to exhibit Parker's character as it is revealed to us by witnesses, the testimony of whom, is unimpeachable. And this instance of true humility and self-depreciation is worthy of the brightest and best days of the early Church.

Parker had not overestimated the anxieties, difficulties and confusions into which his election to the Archiepiscopate was to plunge him. One's head grows dizzy; one's mind is bewildered at the

multiplicity and the diversity of matters which crowd the correspondence from that time on. The only wonder is that he could have borne up under the pressure for nearly sixteen years. There was that in it which must have tasked to the utmost, not only his physical and intellectual, but his moral powers as well; and at times all supports left him except his conscious integrity and the grace of God. We shall select some events and occurrences which exhibit the less known and public parts of the Archbishop's life, and add a few words concerning his relations to that party in England, whose writers have branded him as a bitter persecutor.

All sorts of people, popish recusants, and puritan non-conformists, were sent to him that he might bring them to better minds as to their duties in Church or State. Among others, Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, and Tonstal, of Durham, were his guests as long as they lived. Tonstal died before his consecration. Thirlby was sent to him in 1563, on account of the plague in London, together with Boxall, Dean of Peterboro'. The letters exchanged on the occasion are pleasant reading, because they show, not only that some state prisoners, at least, were in a less desperate condition than we are apt to fancy; but, also, that there was kindly intercourse between those who had risen and those who had fallen with the change of dynasty. Who can question, indeed, that time and intercourse might have softened all asperities, and harmonized nearly all dissensions, had not the insane folly of the Popes, and the headstrong self-will of the leading "precisians" interfered to perpetuate both?

Thirlby writes: "Your grace knoweth the proverb, 'an unbidden guest knoweth not where to sit.' Although we be unbidden, yet we are not unappointed. Mr. Boxall and I be assigned to remain with your grace, I think you shall know by the Lords of the Councils' letter, ... I mind to bring with me all my family of the Tower, that is my man and my boy; for when I told my boy that I would leave him behind me, he made earnest suit to take him with me, saying, that he doubted not since by your means he came into the Tower, that by your good contentation he might go with me out of the Tower. . . . . I doubt what ways we may come without danger of plague to your grace, all the places in the way being so sore infected, yet they say need maketh the old wife to trot. . . . . I pray God to bring us well to you, and to preserve your grace to His pleasure." Parker replies, "Sir, as an unbidden guest as ye write, knoweth not where to sit, so a guest bidden or unbidden, being content with that which he shall find, shall deserve to be the better welcome. If ye bring with you your man and your

young quinster too, ye shall not be refused; and if your companion in journey can content himself with one man to attend upon him, your lodgings shall the sooner be prepared, ... and thus God send you a quick passage."

The arrangement had its inconveniences for the Archbishop owing to the smallness of his house; "having not many under a hundred persons uprising and down-lying therein, besides divers of any family which for straightness of lodging be otherwhere abroad." Besides there was danger of the plague. He disavowed every fear for himself, but was bound to consider the safety of his family, and so continued to send them at first to an unoccupied dwelling in the town near his house, "till such time as they were better blown with this fresh air for a fourteen days." Thirlby remained his guest at Bekesbourne and Lambeth for nearly seven years, as long, indeed, as he lived.

One day in May, when these guests had been with him some eight months, a letter came from the Queen ordering Parker to receive either at Canterbury or Bekesbourne the French ambassador, M. de Gousur, and to treat him

"With all courtesy meet for the place that he holdeth, not meaning thereby that you should neglect the place that you hold in our Church, nor that you should receive him but at the entry of your Church or house, not to conduct him further than the limit of the said Church or house."

Early in June the Archbishop wrote to Cecil, giving him an account of his reception and entertainment of the embassy, and the letter is instructive as well as entertaining. Parker is impressed with the carefulness of the inquiries made as to the Church of England. It was clearly a thing very much in their minds. So, as they came at "2 o'clock on Friday," the Archbishop to give "an occasion of conference," walked in his garden, "conversing familiarly with the gentlemen of the country," and was soon joined by the ambassador, with the Bishop of Constance, "who appeared to be a good, soft-natured gentleman," as interpreter.

"The substance of his inquisition was much for the order and using of our religion; the particularities whereof, I discoursed with him. He noted much, and delighted in our mediocrity, charging the Genevians and the Scottish of going too far in extremities. I perceive that they thought, before their coming, we had neither *statas preces*, nor choice of days of abstinence, as Lent, &c., nor orders ecclesiastical, nor persons of our profession in any regard or estimation, or of any ability, amongst us."

It is curious to see how old the present ordinary slanders against the Church of England are. The "no-ability" accusation reminds us of certain schools of this present century. The embassy clearly got its eyes somewhat opened. And Parker seems to have spoken the last word to some purpose.

"I answered, that I would wish them to come nigher to us, *grounding ourselves* (as we do) *upon the apostolical doctrine and pure times of the primitive Church.*" They were contented to "hear evil of the pope," Gallicans have ever been, "and bragged how strict they had been aforetime against that authority. But I said our proceedings here in England always were not in words, as in Edward the Third's days, &c., and the pope would never again win at our hands that then he lost in open field concerning provisions, &c."

The Archbishop did not altogether confine himself to matters ecclesiastical, but gave his guests a glimpse of the "armory" he was compelled to keep up, "whereby they did see that we had some preparation against their invasion, if it had been so purposed." Finally he sent them, thankful doubtless, to be rid of them, and rather surprised "that he could not charge them either with word or deed, or purloining the worth of one silver spoon." "Somewhat otherwise," he adds, "than I did doubt of before;" and with this little, truly English touch of nationality we leave this curious narration.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. V.—DR. McCLINTOCK'S CYCLOPÆDIA, METHODISM, AND THE CHURCH.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. JOHN McCLINTOCK, D. D., and JAMES STRONG, S. T. D. Vols. I, II, and III. *New York, Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square,* 1869.

METHODISM is an anomaly. Originating with men of the largest culture, its chief influence hitherto has been over the masses. Having a ministry neither classically or theologically trained, it has occasionally produced rare scholars, and ripe divines. With an absolute power of appointment and removal in its Episcopate, which has scarce a parallel in ecclesiastical history, yet it is the popular religious organization of our Republic, exhibiting often the laxity and wildness of an excessive democracy. While its litera-

ture consists largely of crude discourses, compiled volumes, rough biographies, and undigested treatises, yet the works of its founders are remarkable for extensiveness of erudition and beauty of diction; much of its hymnology exhibits not only the poet's fire but the poet's art; its standard of Theology prepared by a self-taught scholar is unsurpassed in style, learning, and arrangement; the American record of its history shows vigor, research, and ability; and now we are presented with a Cyclopædia, published in our own metropolis, without a rival, at least, in the variety and fulness of its topics, although it can not claim distinguished originality in their treatment.

This vast compilation was commenced seventeen years since, and is not yet completed. All previous works on chronology, history, geography—dictionaries, encyclopædias, commentaries—together with all treatises on cognate subjects in art, science, literature, statistics, government—have been fully examined, and freely appropriated. The clip of the scissors has been as familiar to the Editors as the stroke of the pen. But whatever the processes employed, the result is such a treasure of information on all ecclesiastical subjects as can scarcely be exceeded in extent, or in utility. The arrangement is convenient. The treatment is exhaustive. The style is scholarly. The learning is immense. The spirit is liberal. The information is usually accurate. Every library will receive an accession of wealth from these volumes, and Methodism may well congratulate herself on the largeness and success of such a literary achievement, both as regards her Editors and her Publishers. Dr. Smith's Dictionary indeed evinces far more originality of treatment, and is both more scholarly and more churchly, and deserves a higher place in ecclesiastical literature. It exhibits the maturity of European culture and learning. But on the other hand its vast stores have been freely appropriated in the American work, whose range is wider, especially in biography, and whose practical adaptation is at least equally great. Indeed the two works are properly complements of each other, instead of rivals, and both should adorn the shelves of every well-selected library.

Of course in all treatises and compilations from denominational sources we must expect a summary disposition of the claims of the Church. The whole subject of Apostolic Episcopacy is most im-

perfectly discussed. We cannot but feel that the Editors have never in this department pursued any independent investigation. Still, while wholly superficial, they intend to be fair, and perhaps no work from sectarian pens could be less narrow, or more liberal.

The examination of this Cyclopædia has waked a sigh that with the culture and learning of the American Church, we have no work similar in plan, and superior in execution. We also regret that with all the rich and unrivalled treasures accumulated through centuries by the labor and genius of Anglican Divines, we have no complete and exhaustive standard of Theology. We know the objections to such works. Yet we believe, if wisely prepared, the benefit would exceed the injury. They would prevent the humiliation of depending on sectarian treatises. They would be invaluable in our Theological Seminaries. They would be useful to our Parish Clergymen. They would be instructive to our intelligent laymen. They would harmonize our differences, and promote uniformity in opinion, and feeling, and action. As they could only succeed by expressing the doctrinal consciousness of the Church, so they would enlarge the learning of the Church, and deepen the faith of the Church. Perhaps there are the scholars now training in our Colleges and Seminaries who will bless posterity by devoting their lives to works whose usefulness would secure their immortality.

But as American Churchmen will doubtless often use the Cyclopædia we have discussed, and as our respect is now compelled for the learning of Methodism, we propose devoting the remainder of our Article to a brief investigation of our relations to Methodism. For this vast organization we can never cease to have a strong historic sympathy. It sprang from the Anglican Church. It was founded by Anglican Clergymen. It shows everywhere, with all its eccentric departures, and extravagant ways, the unmistakable impress of its Anglican origin. We see in its formularies, and its articles the fragments of our mutilated Prayer Book. Our hope is that the erring child having withdrawn from its home, owing to a want of a wise and appreciative sympathy, will, sobered, and matured by experience, yet return to its maternal bosom, now glowing with more tender, and genial affections.

And here we remark that the bond between Methodism, and

the Church, is not all in John Wesley's belief in the necessity of Episcopal ordination for a valid ministry. His famous letter of rebuke to Coke and Asbury, was rather an ebullition of his feelings, than an expression of his opinions. We are not to let the flash of a moment blind us to the action of years. A few words blazing with a just indignation are not to outweigh utterances repeatedly made, carefully pondered and thoughtfully recorded. The truth is John Wesley's views experienced an entire revolution, all the steps of which we are prepared to trace. He was by education, by inheritance, and by temperament a Churchman. When ordained Deacon, and Presbyter, he believed firmly in the Apostolic succession. His high views of Episcopal order accompanied him to America, and returned with him to England. Long after the flame of revival had fully burst upon the world, and he had begun his almost unparalleled labors in preaching, and writing, and traveling, during which he exhibited such a glow of zeal, and power of eloquence, we find him, in the very manly maturity of his intellect, thus expressing himself in a letter to Mr. Hall.

"We believe it would not be right in us to administer either Baptism or the Lord's Supper, unless we had a commission to do so from those Bishops whom we apprehend to be in succession from the Apostles. We believe there is, and always was in every Christian Church, an outward Priesthood ordained by Jesus Christ, and an outward sacrifice offered therein by men authorized to act as ambassadors of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. We believe that the threefold order of ministers, is not only authorized by the Apostolical institutions, but by the written Word."

This letter, containing opinions so unqualified, and unequivocal, was written on the 30th of December, 1745. On the 20th of the following January, just three weeks after, we find a record in his journal, which shows the beginning of an entire revolution of the views in which he had been educated and ordained. He says:

"I set out for Bristol. On the road I read over Lord King's account of the Primitive Church. In spite of the vehement prejudice of my education I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draft, but, if so, it would follow, that Bishops and Presbyters are essentially one order, and that originally every Christian congregation was a church independent of all others."

On the 3d of July, 1756, he thus wrote to the Rev. Mr. Clark:

"As to my own judgment, I still believe the Episcopal form of government to be Scriptural and Apostolical. I mean well agreeing with the practice, and writings of the Apostles, but that it is prescribed in Scripture, I do not believe. This opinion which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of, ever since I read Stillingfleet's "Irenicon." I think he has unanswerably proved, that neither Christ nor His Apostles prescribed any particular form of church government, and that the plea of divine right for diocesan episcopacy was never heard of in the Primitive Church."

Thus we find that in a little more than ten years the unfortunate seed of schism dropped into the mind of Mr. Wesley by Lord King, had reached maturity under the influence of Stillingfleet. The way was preparing for a lawless act by a good, and great, and venerable man, which is the only real stain on a pure and noble life, but which has its apology in the infirmities of an advanced age. Whatever Mr. Wesley's abstract views of Episcopacy, his ordination of Coke was a flagrant violation of established order, which resulted logically, and inevitably, in that eventual separation of Methodism from the Church which during his life he so constantly deprecated, and so successfully resisted. His own views of the necessity, and legality of a most revolutionary, and inexcusable measure, are expressed in a letter to his American Superintendent, and Brethren, bearing date, Sept. 10th, 1784.

"Lord King's account of the Primitive Church convinced me many years ago, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain. For many years I have been importuned from time to time to exercise this right of ordaining part of our traveling preachers. But I have still refused, not only for peace sake, but because I determined as little as possible to violate the established order of the National Church to which I belonged. But the case is widely different between England, and North America. Here there are Bishops who have a legal jurisdiction; in America there are none."

But whatever were Mr. Wesley's individual opinions on such a subject, he knew that the whole Anglican Church would regard with indignation and almost horror their practical application. Lord Mansfield had pronounced, that "ordination was separation." We do not dispute the integrity, and purity of the venerable founder of Methodism. Yet surely for a Presbyter to consecrate a Superintendent in name,—afterwards styled Bishop,—in the face of legal advice, of ecclesiastical tradition, and Episcopal authority, was a most palpable violation of law, a pernicious precedent for

schism, and the moving cause of a separation which had been repeatedly pronounced sinful, ruinous, and even accursed. Still it is in vain for us to deny the strength of conviction which such a measure implies, especially after tracing its origin and history in his own words for nearly one half of a century. We now proceed to prove that every circumstance shows Mr. Wesley's letter of rebuke to Coke and Asbury was an expression of his feelings and not of his opinions. A passage from Lee's History of Methodism evinces the peculiarly aggravating nature of the offence committed by these usually excellent, and devoted men. They were evidently marked by an ambition to have a title which the Father of Methodism had never intended, and which gave them in name an indelicate and improper superiority over himself, so far surpassing them in learning, in eloquence, in ability, and every attribute of greatness. It was a sharp trial that the patriarch Wesley should remain a Presbyter, while the unlettered Asbury was styled a Bishop. We need not marvel at the scathing and almost unequalled reproof elicited by such an offensive anomaly, especially when all the circumstances of the assumption are considered. Lee gives the following account.

"In the course of this year, 1787, Mr. Asbury reprinted the General Minutes, but in a different form from what they were before. The title of the pamphlet was as follows. 'A form of discipline for the ministers, preachers, and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, considered, and approved at a Conference held at Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, on Monday, the 27th day of December, 1784.' In this Discipline there were thirty-one questions with answers to them all. The third question in the second section, and the answer read thus. Q. Is there any other business to be done in Conference? A. The electing, and ordaining *Bishops*, Elders and Deacons. *This was the first time our Superintendents ever gave themselves the title of Bishops in the minutes. They changed the title themselves without the consent of the Conference.*"

Here is the offence which explains the spirit of Mr. Wesley's celebrated letter, whose condensed and caustic satire is scarcely equalled in literature. He says:

"I study to be little; you study to be great; I creep; you strut along. One instance of this your greatness has given me great concern. How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called a Bishop? I shudder, I start at the very thought. Men may call me a knave, or a fool, or a rascal, or a scoundrel, and I am content. But they shall never by my consent call me Bishop. For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake put a full end to this."

But while we are not to take this explosion of John Wesley for proof against his own deliberate record for years, and his own act of lawless consecration, it remains that Charles Wesley—the poet, the orator, the saint, whose hymns glow with the most fervid inspirations of Christian genius, and will bear until the end of time the praise of the Church to Heaven—was, to the close of his devoted life, a strong and consistent believer in the fact of Apostolic Succession, and the necessity of Episcopal Ordination. It is almost amusing to see how zealously one of the Fathers of Methodism defends a truth so odious to the Sons of Methodism. Surely *he* will not be called a narrow bigot, a cold formalist, or a jesuitical romancer. No man's bosom ever kindled with warmer Christian affections. No man's mind ever enlarged with a broader Christian charity. No man's life ever evinced a more beautiful Christian devotion. Yet Charles Wesley wrote in his famous letter to one of our own venerated American bishops, lawfully consecrated in the Apostolic Succession, that he might perpetuate in our country a true branch of the One Holy Catholic, and Apostolic Church,

"I can scarcely yet believe that in his *eighty-second* year, my brother, my old intimate friend and companion should have assumed the Episcopal character, ordained elders, consecrated a bishop, and set him to ordain lay-preachers in America. I was then at his elbow at Bristol, yet he never gave me the least hint of his intention. What will become of those poor sheep in the wilderness, the American Methodists? How have they been betrayed into a separation from the Church of England, which their preachers, and they no more intended than the Methodists here? Had they had patience a little longer they would have seen a *real* primitive Bishop in America, duly consecrated by the Scotch Bishops, who have their consecration from the English Bishops, and are acknowledged by them as the same with themselves. There is therefore not the least difference betwixt the members of Bishop Seabury's Church and the members of the Church of England. You know that I had the happiness to converse with that truly apostolical man, who is esteemed by all who know him as much as by you and me. He told me he looked upon the Methodists in America as sound members of the Church, and was ready to ordain their preachers whom he should find duly qualified. *His ordination would indeed be genuine, valid and Episcopal.* But what are your poor Methodists now? Only a new sect of Presbyterians."

Our object in this investigation has not been to excite prejudice but to ascertain truth. While our sympathy with Methodism should be cultivated its grounds should also be understood. We think we

have demonstrated the true import of the oft cited, and generally misconceived rebuke to Coke, and Asbury. Our bond of connection with Methodism in its relation to Apostolic Succession and Episcopal Ordination is not the opinion of John Wesley but the belief of Charles Wesley, who in all respects lived and died a pronounced CHURCHMAN.

But with the great Patriarch of this vast and flourishing organization we have other points of complete identity. Both the remarkable brothers held precisely the views of the Sacraments contained in the articles and the offices of the Church. John Wesley taught uniformly and unequivocally that very doctrine of Regeneration in infant Baptism, denounced by modern Methodists, as the germ of all formalism and error. The proof of the fact is abundant, and incontrovertible. He thus expresses himself in his sermons.

"There may sometimes be the outward sign where there is not the inward grace. I do not now speak with regard to infants. It is certain our Church believes that all who are baptized in infancy are born again, and it is allowed that the whole office for the Baptism of infants proceeds on this supposition. Nor is it an objection of any weight against this that we cannot comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it can be wrought in a person of riper years. Lean no more on the staff of that broken reed that ye *were* born again in Baptism. Who denies that ye were then made children of God, and heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven?"

Also in his "Treatise on Baptism," bearing date Nov. 11th, 1756, he records opinions which he never changed.

"This which can relate to infants only is a clear proof that the whole race of mankind are obnoxious both to the guilt and punishment of Adam's transgression. And the virtue of this free gift, the merits of Christ's life and death, are applied to us in Baptism. Agreeably to this our Church prays in the Baptismal Office, that the person to be baptized may be washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins and enjoy the everlasting benediction of His heavenly washing. By Baptism we are admitted into the Church, and consequently made members of Christ its Head. By water then as a means, the water of Baptism, we are regenerated, or born again, whence it is also called by the Apostle the washing of Regeneration. Our Church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to Baptism than Christ Himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace. *Herein a principle of grace is infused* which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Spirit of God by long-continued wickedness."

With regard to the holy Eucharist, John Wesley expressed the very meaning of our Communion Office.

"I showed at large that the Lord's Supper was ordained by God to be a means of conveying to men either preventing, or justifying, or sanctifying grace according to their several necessities. The grace of God given therein confirms to us the pardon of our sins, and enables us to leave them. As our bodies are strengthened by bread and wine, so are our souls by these tokens of the Body and Blood of Christ. *This is the food of our souls.*"

John Wesley's hereditary and profound regard for our noble Church Formularies is not only seen in their liberal transfer to the standard of American Methodism, but also in strong words written in advanced life when the glow of a heavenly glory was beginning to shine over his venerable features. He says:

"I believe there is no Liturgy in the world, either in ancient or modern language, which breathes more of a solid, scriptural, devotional piety than the Common Prayer of the Church of England, and though the main of it was compiled more than two hundred years ago, yet is the language of it not only pure, but strong and elegant in the highest degree."

We are now prepared to estimate according to the truth of history the relations between Methodism and the Church. It seems demonstrable that John Wesley after the year 1745, through the influence of "Lord King's account of the Primitive Church," and Stillingfleet's "Irenicon," entirely changed his views of the Order of the Church. His reproof of his American Superintendents was a blaze of sudden indignation, and must not prevail against opinions long entertained, frequently repeated, and carried into practice by a bold act of pretended consecration. On the contrary, Charles Wesley was always an ardent believer in the truth of the Apostolic Succession, and the virtue of Episcopal Ordination. Both brothers taught the Regeneration of the Infant in Baptism, and the Grace of the Holy Communion, precisely as inculcated in the Sacramental Offices of the Prayer Book. Considering therefore the two Founders of Methodism as properly constituting one united head, we find in their writings all that now makes a devoted Son of the Church ridiculous and repulsive in the eyes of sectarian prejudice. Nevertheless, while *firm in* our principles, regardless of abuse and opposition, let us diligently cultivate our *true* historic sympathies, that we may promote the unity of Christendom by the final triumph of an Apostolic Catholicity.

We cannot conclude our Article without glancing at the anomalous position of American Methodism. Nor would we be considered as regarding it with hostility. On the contrary, we view its advances with the deepest interest. We remember its Anglican origin. We remember that its Founders were clergymen, ordained by Bishops in the true succession. We remember that its articles and its offices are adopted from the maternal Church, so that from Baptism to Burial its sons and daughters have the same formularies with ourselves. We remember its rapid improvement in collegiate education, in theological discipline and periodical literature. We remember the vigor and efficiency of its vast organization. We remember, finally, that its multitudes will be needed at the ballot-box in that coming contest with the Papacy which is to decide the future of our Continent, and whose tokens are already discernible in the Heavens. Hence, we would speak in kindness of two opposing elements, which, with all its seeming compactness and power, threaten the ultimate existence of Methodism, and may scatter its fragments back to the communion of the Apostolic Church. Our allusion is to the genius of its government, and the genius of its policy. It seems to unite a theoretical tyranny with a relaxing democracy. It exhibits the most antagonistic extremes. It subjects its ministers to the absolute will of its Episcopate, while its reliance for the increase of its members is a system of intense emotionalism. An itinerancy, presupposes, lodged somewhere a supreme power of appointment—on the one hand, necessary to avoid the conflicts of innumerable interests; and on the other, forever opposed to every principle of rational liberty. To show that our statements are not without warrant, we give a remarkable extract from a speech delivered in the General Conference, in the year 1844, by the most extraordinary man for exquisite culture, manly grace, impressive eloquence, and saintly piety, whom Methodism has produced on this Continent, and who, in grasp and brilliance of genius, has had scarcely a superior in America. That his argument declared the consciousness of the body is proven by the fact that it elevated him to the Episcopate. It unquestionably states the law, and expresses the soul of Methodism. The speech is so startling and so marvellous in its positions that we give a copious extract:—

"I argue this authority in the General Conference, first, from the genius

of our polity on points which most nearly resemble this strict amenability in Church officers, subordinate and superior, is provided for in our Discipline. From the class-leader, upward, this amenability not only regards major, but minor morals; not only the vices, but the improprieties of behaviour. The class-leader, by mere eccentricity, becomes unpopular in his class. The pastor, at discretion, removes him from office. The exhorter, or unordained local preacher, proves unacceptable, and a Quarterly Conference refuses to renew his license. The itinerant pastor is not useful in his charge; the Bishop, or presiding elder, deposes him from his charge, or from the pastoral office, and makes him an assistant. The presiding elder impairs his usefulness on a district, not by gross malfeasance but by a slight misfeasance or offence, still because he is not popular, the Bishop removes him to a station, or a circuit, and, perhaps, makes him an assistant. I speak not now of annual appointments, when the term of the itinerant expires by limitation, but of removals by the Bishop or the presiding elder in the intervals of Conference, which always imply a deposing from office, as well as a stationing act. In all these instances the manner of removing from office is peculiar. 1. *It is summary, without accusation, trial, or formal sentence.* 2. *It is for no crime, and generally for no misdemeanor, but for being unacceptable.* 3. Most of the removals from office are by a sole agent; namely, by a Bishop or preacher, *whose will is omnipotent in the premises.* 4. The removing officer is not obliged to assign any cause for deposing. If he do so, it is through courtesy, and not as a right. *The deposed officer has no appeal.* If indiscreetly or unnecessarily removed, he must submit, for there is no tribunal authorized to cure the error or rectify the wrong. But we believe there are good and sufficient reasons for granting this high power of removal to those who exercise it. It promotes religion; it binds the Church in a strong and almost indissoluble unity; it quickens the communication of healing influences to the infected and enfeebled parts of the body eeclesiastical; in a word, it is a system of surpassing energy. The system is worthy of all eulogy."

We venture to say that such a depositum of irresponsible power is lodged no where but in the Methodist Episcopate. It must have been prudently exercised, or the body would have been rent into fragments. How amusing the contrast between the prerogatives of the rulers of Methodism and the functions of our own Apostolic Bishops, who have scarcely any powers, except of ordination, consecration, confirmation, presidency, and supervision. A colossal religious structure, stretching over the continent, and gathering millions to itself, however admirable in many of its aspects, yet resting on an absolute authority, and an excessive emotionalism has to apprehend with increase of vigor and increase of growth, an increase of peril. May Methodism escape the danger, by not only retaining the Faith of the Church, but returning to Her Order!

Art. VI.—THE INCARNATION.

Every now and then, it becomes necessary in the history of society, and of the Church to go back to first truths, to elemental principles. It is not so much that these first truths come to be formally denied, but that being universally acknowledged and taken for granted, their very familiarity hides from us their depth of meaning. That great Christian truth—the Incarnation—has been for some ages an illustration of this fact. While all devoutly acknowledge it in the Creed, and with heart and mind confess it to be at the foundation of Christian faith and hope, yet the intense contemplation in later times of the sacrificial death of Christ, and of the external and judicial effects of that sacrifice, as an offering for sin, has greatly obscured the full meaning and the pervading effect of the Incarnation, in the economy of salvation.

The Augustinian theology is the seed-bed, out of which, as it seems to us, this modern, one-sided aspect of Christianity has sprung. For a long time the Incarnation has been deemed of no other importance than as a necessary foundation for the merit and virtue of the expiatory sacrifice, and for the forensic distribution of the benefits of that expiation to those elect persons for whom only it was designed. The Augustinian theology presumptuously undertakes to answer the question which our Lord and Master refused to answer—"Are there few that be saved?" In the Mediæval ages it answered this question dogmatically, by the double affirmation, that only a few elect could be saved, and that all the elect would be baptized. Add to this the accordant dogma of the indefectibility of grace, and you have that tissue of contradictions, of arbitrary assumptions, and of narrow technicalities, which have been the opprobria of Christianity, and a fruitful source of unbelief in all the history of the Church.

In the second generation after the Reformation, the Sacraments grew into disrepute with an active and earnest section of the Protestants, and came to be regarded as little better than dead forms and beggarly elements. Discarding, therefore, the Sacraments from all effectual operation, these persons retained the theology of Augustine, under its modern name of Calvinism, and affirmed it to be the only pure gospel. As a natural reaction from this

phase of corruption, multitudes have renounced the gospel itself as thus represented.

Romanism in settling down upon its own distinctive basis as a sect, retained in vigorous exclusiveness the sacramental part of the Mediæval system, and while some of its schools adhered firmly to the Augustian theology, other schools gradually softened the sterner and more repulsive features of that theology, and have come very near to the Pelagian heresy.

The Christian consciousness of that immense majority of the English and American Church, which has revolted from the narrowness of Puritanism, has held with more or less distinctness, the true sense of the Incarnation, and has consequently assigned to the sacraments their actual meaning and purpose in the economy of salvation.

The confused and imperfect conception of the meaning, and effect of the Incarnation is painfully exhibited by the accepted representations of the beginning of spiritual life, in both the Romish and the Puritan systems of theology. Both assume a partial redemption. The Romish view of this partial redemption is that the beginning of spiritual life is in Baptism. The baptized therefore are the elect, and they only can be saved. The Puritan version of the same dogma is that spiritual life begins at the so-called conversion of the adult subject; and that therefore Christ *has no connection with our nature* until this epoch in the personal history of the elect.

Few of our own people, imbued as they must be with the genial and catholic spirit of the Liturgy, can hold either of these systems in their naked severity, for both are hopelessly at variance with that spirit, and with fact, experience, and consciousness. Every one is compelled to modify one or the other system more or less distinctly. But such has been the pervading influence of the Augustinian theology upon the thought and speech of Christendom, that the language of one or the other of these systems is familiarly used by writers and preachers, and men array themselves into hostile parties, having for their shibboleths the terminology of the Romish or of the Puritan version of election. It is very easy for the partisans of each of these systems to point out the error of their antagonists; and seeing that error so plainly, they cling with more intense devotion to their own cherished dogma as the only refuge from the

falsehood mutually charged. Thus the vain contest between these related but warring errors continues from age to age.

In trying to determine this question of the beginning of spiritual life in man, both the opposing schools of theology have undertaken to declare the precise nature of that "original righteousness" which was the condition of man before the fall, and of that "original sin" which became his condition after the fall. To attempt to elucidate one obscure subject by the light of another far more obscure is not a very hopeful task. The endless mazes of this inquiry are fruitful themes for subtle disquisition, but can bring us no nearer to a solution of the actual problem of humanity. For in all the conflicting theories upon these subjects, both parties seem to have forgotten that whatever may have been the meaning and effect of that death incurred by the first apostacy, neither Adam nor his posterity were permitted to remain in that state. For instantly upon the sentence and its execution came the redemption in Christ Jesus. In Him human nature was once again touched by the Divine nature, and revivified by the Life-giving Spirit, and placed in a new state of probation, under the new economy of grace. Hence to determine what man is or would be without grace is an absolutely insoluble, and therefore idle problem, because there is not a single element of known fact, for its solution, beyond the revealed description of the fruits of nature, and of the fruits of the Spirit, and this description is given in terms which apply to that complex state of redeemed humanity in which the fruits of both in some degree appear.

The Romish theologian, J. A. Moehler, gives an elaborate account of the speculations of the School-men of the Protestant and Romish Divines, on the question of original justice and original sin. While defending the dogma of his own party, he often makes very sound and just reflections, although inconsistent with the position he is obliged to defend. In one place he says:

"Now, it is an universal truth, holding good of all, even the highest orders and circles of intellectual creatures, . . that no finite being can exist in a living moral communion with the Deity, save by the communion of the same Holy Spirit. This relation of Adam to God, as it exalted him above human nature, and made him participate in that of God, is hence termed a supernatural gift of Divine grace, superadded to the endowments of nature. Moreover, this more minute explanation of the dogma, concerning the

original holiness and justice of Adam, is not merely a private opinion of theologians, but an integral part of that dogma, and hence, itself a dogma." Again he says, "Divinity must stoop to humanity, if humanity is to become divine. Hence, did the Son of God, in order to reconcile humanity with the godhead. . . . Divine grace must ever compassionately stoop to our lowliness, and impart to our sin-polluted faculties the first heavenly consecration, in order to prepare them for the Kingdom of Heaven, and the receiving of Christ's image." (*Symbolism, pages* 116, 178).

This is a very accurate description of the effect of the Incarnation upon our humanity, and it is borne out by all the phenomena of human history. For, good and evil, a reaching after God and a fearful depravity, have struggled together in that humanity in all ages and in all nations, as the same writer very beautifully proves when he describes the high attainments of heathen morality and religion. But when he ascribes these results to unassisted nature he simply contradicts the above profound conclusions.

The two theories which give rise to this confusion, and which refer the commencement of spiritual life in man, one to baptism, the other to conversion, are a reproduction in a modified form of the ancient heresy which made the Incarnation to be the union of the Divine Nature with a human person, the Man Jesus, and so to have consecrated only that person, already a perfect human being. In opposition to this heresy, the truth elaborately established by the Church as the meaning of the Creed is, that HUMAN NATURE, the common nature of us all, was assumed by the Son of God, and consecrated by the adorable mystery—God with us: The Word made Flesh.

The exhaustive labors of the Fathers and Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, accurately defining the truth of the Incarnation, in opposition to many successive heresies, have virtually determined the very question, which is now bandied back and forth between the advocates of these two opposing systems in regard to the beginning of spiritual life in man. The doctrine of the Incarnation, so clearly settled by the Fathers, teaches us, that the Son of God assumed to Himself in the person of Christ, the second Adam—not another human person, not this or that man—but human nature, in indissoluble connection, *thereby enduing that nature*, as it successively comes into being in each person, with His life. It is *this life* which makes the subject of it, whether infant or adult, capable of admission into the Church—THE MYS-

TICAL BODY OF CHRIST—by Baptism, there to be fed, nourished, and strengthened, and perfected by all the means of grace and growth. This truth alone gives an adequate account of all the phenomena of human life and character in the matter of salvation.

It will help to remove the confusion and imperfection of the popular conception of the Incarnation, to look back at the successive distinctions and definitions, by which this fundamental truth was clearly and immovably established. That truth is indeed positively stated in the original Creed of the Church, both in its Western and Eastern form. But as misapprehensions of this truth —common enough with the masses of Christian people—were magnified by obstinate and perverse teaching into heresies, the faithful pastors of the Church were compelled to express the same truth more clearly, not by changing the words of the Creed, but by defining with all the accuracy and subtlety of which language is capable, the very and essential meaning of the Creed. This exposition of the Creed by the General Councils is given positively, in the form of definitions, and of Œcumenical letters, and negatively, by Anathemas specifying the particular errors to be avoided.

The whole brood of confusions and denials which centre around the mystery of the Incarnation are summarily contained in the skeptical question of the Jews in the very presence of our Lord, when He declared His flesh to be "the life of the world." "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" (St. John vi. 51–2.) The mystery at which they stumbled was, that the Son of God—the Divine Nature—could be so united to human nature in the Person of the humble Man they saw, as by that union to communicate life—the life of God—to all men. It was the mystery of the SECOND ADAM, Christ, the new begining of redeemed humanity: imparting His exalted nature just as effectually and universally as the first Adam had imparted his corrupt nature to the whole of his descendants.

The first error on this subject was that of the Gnostics, or Docetæ, who taught that "our Lord's body was but a phantom, and that He came not in the flesh, but in appearance only." This teaching was in the lifetime of the Apostles, and was so fully rebuked by them as never to have been revived. Afterwards Arius

[illegible] the Son of God did not take human nature, but a [illegible], and that the Divine Word was in the place of [illegible] Apollinarius went a little further, and said, that [illegible] took a human body and a sensitive or animal soul, but [illegible] place of the rational soul was supplied by God the Word. [illegible] either of these suppositions was human nature taken into [illegible] with the Deity, and Christ, although truly the Son of God, was not at all the Son of man, and so the Son of God was not "made man," as the Creed affirms.

Long after these errors were disposed of, and "in Christ the verity of God and the complete substance of man were with full agreement established throughout the world." (*Hooker*, b. 5, s. 52.) Nestorius taught either directly or by necessary implication, that "there was not only two natures, but two persons in Christ, viz: the person of God the Son, and the person of the man Christ Jesus." This statement really denied the doctrine of the Incarnation, because by its terms our human nature was only in contact with the Divine Nature in the Christ, and was not taken up into the Divine Nature to make of the two natures one indivisible person. This error was condemned by the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431.

Again Eutyches, with the fancy so common in our day, that the best way to escape from an error is by getting as far away from it as possible, in opposition to the Nestorian doctrine of two persons in Christ, asserted that the divine and human natures of Christ, although originally distinct, yet, "after their union became but one nature, the human nature being transubstantiated into the Divine." But this statement equally denied the fact of the Incarnation—God made man—because it left no human nature to subsist in indissoluble union with the Divine nature. And so the fourth Gen. Council, that of Chalcedon, defined, that "In Christ two distinct natures are united in one person, without any change, mixture, or confusion." (*Har. Brown*, Art. 2, Sec. 1.)

The circle of definitions fencing in this part of the Creed from human perversion was thus complete. The result of the whole is the establishment of the position, that it is an inadequate and deceiving conception of the Incarnation, to suppose that the Son of God was united to a human person—one unit of the myriads composing the human race. For then the indwelling of the Godhead

would only have redeemed and sanctified that one person, and *human nature* must still have subsisted in unrelieved corruption and depravity. Hooker beautifully states this conclusion and its consequences.

"It pleased not the Word, or Wisdom of God, to take to itself some one person amongst men, for then should that one have been advanced, which was assumed, and no more; but Wisdom, to the end she might save many, built her house of that nature which is common unto all; she made not this or that man her habitation, but 'dwelt *in us*.' The seeds of herbs and plants at the first, are not in act, but in possibility, that which they afterwards grow to be. If the Son of God had taken to Himself a man new made and perfected, it would of necessity follow, that there are in Christ two persons, the one assuming and the other assumed; whereas the Son of God did not assume a man's person to His own, but a man's nature to His own Person; and therefore took *Semen*, the seed of Abraham, the very first original element of our nature, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence. The flesh, and the conjunction of the flesh with God, began at one instant, ... so that in Christ there is no personal subsistence but one, and that from everlasting." (*Hooker, B.* 5, *S.* 52.)

And it is our nature, the nature of every child born into the world, that is thus redeemed, purified and exalted. And therefore of the myriads—more than half of the human race who die in infancy—we know by faith in the Son of God, that they have been taken from the evil to come, to be with Him of whose nature they partake. For these have not by actual sin crucified the Son of God afresh, nor stamped out from their nature the lineaments of the Divinity, reimparted by the Incarnation, nor driven away the Holy Ghost by whom the union of each one of the redeemed with Christ is mysteriously effected.

It is in the light of this transcendent truth that we must view all the deep and far reaching facts recorded in the history of our incarnate Lord, beginning with the Baptism and immediately subsequent Temptation in the wilderness, and ending with His ascension and session at the right hand of God. Christ, true Man, and, by the infinite love of God, the Representative Man, for us, and on our behalf, and *as containing in Himself the whole race of man*, immediately after His public Ordination at His Baptism, encounters and overcomes all the temptations to which that race is subject. The wiles of the devil, the lust of the flesh, the pride of life, all the evil by which man can be brought into subjection, are condensed into those recorded temptations of our Lord, as OUR

REDEMPTION. He resisted and overcame them, and all who are His can also resist and overcome them by His might, and in His strength, and so achieve in union with Him the life eternal which He has won for that nature, which He wears and has consecrated. With a right perception of this great truth, how miserably jejune, mean, and trifling, is the bastard rationalism which would convert into myth, or parable, or illusion, this profound and pregnant fact, this stupendous crisis in the long trial of humanity.

And so of all the other mysteries of our redemption. They are the sufferings, actings, and triumphs of *our nature* in His Person. We have seen how perspicuously the "judicious" Hooker states the true doctrine of the Incarnation, as expressed in the Creed, and as defined by the early Councils.

In a subsequent passage he beautifully unfolds the necessary effect of this Incarnation upon the whole race of man.

"Thus much no Christian man will deny, that when Christ sanctified His own flesh, giving as God, and taking as man the Holy Ghost, he did not this for Himself only, but for our sakes, that the grace of sanctification and life, which was first received in Him, might *pass from Him to His whole race, as malediction came from Adam to all mankind.* Howbeit, because the work of His Spirit to these effects is in us prevented by sin and death possessing us before; it is of necessity that as well our present sanctification unto newness of life, as the future restoration of our bodies, should presuppose a participation of the grace, efficacy, merit, or virtue of His body and blood; *without which foundation first laid, there is no place for those other operations of the Spirit of Christ to ensue.* So that Christ imparteth plainly Himself, by degrees." (*Ec. P. B.* 5, *Sec.* 56.)

In the same profound sense of this truth, Jeremy Taylor says:

"That God sent into the world His only Son for remedy to human miseries, to ennoble our nature by an union with Divinity," . . . . . that we might "with free dispensation receive the influences of a Saviour with whom we communicate in nature." (*Life of Christ, Part* 1, *Sec.* 1.)

An ancient collect composed by St. Leo, the great champion of the truth of the Incarnation against Nestorius, says:

"O God, who art pleased to save by the nativity of Thy Christ the *race* of man which was mortally wounded in its chief, grant, we beseech Thee, that we may not adhere to the author of our perdition, but be transferred to the fellowship of our Redeemer."

The Rev. J. H. Blunt, who sometimes uses the language of the mediæval version of Augustinianism, in his account of the festival

of Christmas, breaks loose from the narrowness of that theology, and expands to the full conception of the adorable mystery in these words:

"And even beyond the immediate influence of the Church, it is found that the Christmas gladness of the Church is reflected in the world around; and a common instinct of *regenerated human nature* teaches that world to recognize in Christmas a season of unity and fellowship and good will, of happiness and peace." (*An.*, *p.* 77.)

All these human representations fell short of the emphatic expression of the same truth by St. Paul, when he elaborately describes the admission of the Gentiles into the visible Church, the mystical body of Christ, by the similitude of a graft. It is essential to a graft that it must be alive, and even possess a life somewhat of the same nature with the stock, with which it is to be united. To insert a dead branch into a stock would simply wound the latter, and could by no possibility transfer the life of the stock into the branch. And even a living branch of an altogether foreign nature, cannot be successfully grafted into any stock. To give sense and meaning therefore to this favorite illustration of the Apostle, the Gentiles must be regarded as possessed of spiritual life analogous to that of the Church, previous to their engrafting by Baptism into that Church. St. Paul thoroughly recognizes and affirms both conditions. For the Gentiles are described not only as *living* branches, but as branches of a "*wild* Olive tree" to be grafted into the "*good* Olive tree."

Now the life here referred to, which enables men to believe, repent, and turn unto God, and so be capable of Baptism—of engraftment into that "mystical body which is the blessed company of all faithful people," must, either be natural, the "relics of the fall," as Pelagius maintained; or supernatural, *the effect of the Incarnation produced by the Spirit*, as the Church has constantly held in opposition to Pelagius.

St. Augustine (cited by Wall, vol. 1, pp. 380–1,) states the question between Pelagius and the Church thus simply:

"Inasmuch as the question about reconciling man's free will and God's grace is so intricate; that while one is asserted the other may seem to be denied; if he (Pelagius) would grant that God does not only give us a power of doing well, but does also assist us in the willing and doing of it, the controversy would be at an end. . . . . What great matter were it

for him to say this, especially where he undertakes to handle and explain that point? Why should he there defend *nature* only?"

The precise offense here charged against Pelagius is that he refused to refer all effectual power in man to do or to will that which is good to supernatural grace, but persisted in attributing such power to nature: thereby consequentially denying that the Holy Ghost is the only Giver of spiritual life.

Alas! for the weakness of our nature! The very Fathers who, guided by the Holy Spirit, so clearly determined that it was our common nature which was assumed and sanctified in the adorable mystery of the Incarnation; that, as Hooker states it, "the grace of sanctification and life, which was first received in Him, might pass from Him to His whole race, as malediction came from Adam to all mankind," the very Fathers who announced this grand and comprehensive truth, so flagrantly departed from it, as to restrict the benefits of this Incarnation, the grace of God, and all participation of Christ, to that very small number of mankind who might be admitted to the Sacrament of Baptism.

Dr. Craik has shown, in his work on the "Divine Life of the New Birth," that in the first virgin faith of the Church, in the earliest ages, a far wider, more generous, and Christ-like spirit prevailed. To the testimonies which he has collected out of the scanty remains which have come down to us, we add the following from Irenæus.

"For it was not merely for those who believed on Him in the time of Tiberius Cæsar, that Christ came, nor did the Father exercise His providence for men only who are now alive, but for all men altogether, who from the beginning, *according to their capacity*, in their generation, have loved and feared God, and practiced justice and piety toward their neighbors, and have *earnestly desired* to see Christ, and to hear His voice."—(*Irenæus* vs. *Her.*, B. 4, Ch. 22, Sec. 2.)

This passage becomes more beautiful and expressive when compared with the language in which the coming Messiah was announced by the Prophet Haggai, "And THE DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS SHALL COME."

But these generous and scriptural views of the fulness of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus soon gave way before the natural intolerance of the human heart and the narrowness of the mere theological intellect, and presently we hear the very Fathers,

who, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost in the General Councils, vindicated so nobly the great truth, that in Christ human nature had been assumed, redeemed and sanctified, restraining all this wealth of love to the baptized. This technical and Christ-defaming dogma they sternly carried out to its apparent consequence, and remorselessly consigned all unbaptized infants, as well as adults, to everlasting damnation. At the same time, they held, as we have seen, that supernatural grace is necessary to produce that faith and repentance which are required as conditions of Baptism, or, as Hooker expresses it, "a participation" of Christ, "*presupposed as the foundation first laid of all the other operations of the Spirit of Christ, to ensue.*"

Put these two propositions together, and the combination is a clear denial of the possibility of repentance and faith to any but the baptized. And as these graces are the condition precedent, the condition *sine qua non* of Baptism, the two statements deny the possibility of Baptism to those who are not already baptized. That is to say, if both statements are to be received as true, they logically destroy the Christian Religion by resolving it into contradictory and mutually destroying affirmations. Both, therefore, cannot be true. That one is but a public expression of the Creed, and the very sense of the definitions of the early Councils, must be confessed as true; and the other, which contradicts it, is of necessity, therefore, false.

The issue between these two contrasted views of human nature and its relations is distinct and plain. It will not do to play fast and loose with these systems, and use indifferently the language of both. When the Puritan Calvinist affirms that a man can have no participation of Christ and no spiritual life until he is converted, he plainly affirms with Pelagius, that the natural man, apart from Christ, is capable of those Christian graces, faith and repentance, which are the necessary antecedents of conversion. When another person uses the language of mediæval theology, and says, there can be no participation of Christ, and no spiritual life without Baptism; he also affirms with Pelagius, that the natural man can exercise those highest functions of spiritual life, faith and repentance, which are the conditions *sine qua non* of Baptism. For these same parties to turn around then and denounce Pelagianism as false, is to make Christianity a tangled web of contradictions and

inconsistencies, the very result which has driven so many plain people away from Christianity.

A striking illustration of the circle in which the human mind moves occurred the other day in connection with this subject. When, in answer to his inquiries, we stated this doctrine of the Incarnation to a young Divine, he inquired, "Of what value then is the Church, and what is the use of Baptism?" They were the very questions which the Jews put to St. Paul, eighteen hundred years ago. When he argued the salvability of the Gentiles through Christ, the Saviour of the world, their puzzled inquiry was, "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there in circumcision?" It was easy to return to our querist the same answer which St. Paul gave to the objectors of his day. "Much every way."

The greatest of all truths becomes a falsehood, when severed from its divine connections. So, universal redemption has been perverted to the dogma of universal salvation, irrespective of human freedom. The spiritual life thus imparted to humanity by the Incarnation, like all derived life, must be nourished by continual supply from the Fountain of Life, or it will die. Our Lord has ruled the whole case by a multitude of teachings. He is the Body, we are the members. He says emphatically, "I am the Vine, ye are the branches. If a man *abide* not in ME, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

Where the Gospel is preached, where the revealed will of God is made known, there faith, worship, and the sacraments, are the constituted channels of life to the redeemed. Cut off by unbelief, or by wanton neglect, from these channels of supply from Christ the Fountain, and the pre-existing life of the soul shrinks, decays, perishes. Place a compress upon the arm, sufficient to prevent the continuous flow of blood and nerve power to the parts below! How soon would the vigorous life of that strong and steady hand be fatally impaired, and after awhile mortification would ensue, and amputation of the dead and gangrened member become necessary! The very process, in the analogous illustration has been precisely described by the Lord of life. "I am the true Vine, and My Father is the husbandman. Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit, He taketh away." (St. John, xv. 1.)

Human freedom, human will, mysteriously concur with the Divine will in all the relations between God and man. The divine will makes the earth fruitful: but man must plough, and sow, and wait, for the increase. The life of Christ has been imparted to all men by the Holy Ghost in the adorable mystery of Incarnation; and the means by which that life may be so vigorously maintained, nourished, and developed, in this world as to secure eternal life in the world to come, have been freely placed within the reach, and subject to the use, of all to whom the gospel is proposed—to whom "the Kingdom of God has come." Through these channels rightly employed, spiritual food, power, growth, enlargement, continually come to our nature, to purify it, to assimilate it more and more perfectly to the nature of the Word made Flesh. Because He will have none but a free will worship, God requires His redeemed to accept or reject the use of these means of grace, the channels of His life and power. By Baptism we are reborn into that glorious kingdom which came down from Heaven in the Person of the Incarnate Lord. Then as citizens of that kingdom, we have the freedom, the unrestricted use, of all the precious means and mysteries of salvation.

This is the meaning and the use of Baptism. This is the value of that Church of the living God which is the mystical Body of Christ. This is the answer which St. Paul furnished to the ancient Jew and to the modern inquirer. "Much every way; chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God," *all the constituted channels of knowledge and of grace.* "Therefore," he concludes, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace, wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. iii. 2, v. 1–2.)

Those who make Baptism to be the first conveyance of spiritual life to our nature, and those again who restrict that life, to the conversion of the adult subject, do both, although in different degrees detract from the essential value of the Church of God as the appointed agency of salvation. Instead of being, as some suppose a human expediency, or at best a mere accident of Christianity, that Church is constantly spoken of by our blessed Lord as the synonym of Christianity, as the comprehensive formula for the whole body of truth. He Himself commenced His public ministry

by preaching "the kingdom of God is at hand;" and by "preaching the *Gospel of the kingdom.*" The Apostles were sent forth to "preach the Kingdom of God:" and again the seventy are commanded to "say unto them, the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you."

That gross exaggeration of the necessity of Baptism which induced the ancients to allot damnation to all unbaptized infants, came from a failure to appreciate the transcendent mystery of the one Kingdom of God established on earth as the refuge and home of the redeemed, of those who, being first "made alive in Christ," are received into that kingdom, for nurture, for protection, for the continued supply of His grace, His life, His strength. Thus undervaluing the ministry of The Kingdom on earth, they understood our Lord in His conversation with Nicodemus to mean by "the Kingdom of God," exclusively the state of eternal glory. Therefore they supposed our Lord to say that no one without Baptism could see or enter into eternal life. Many were the shifts, evasions, and subterfuges to which the more compassionate theologians were driven to escape from the cruel consequences of this palpable misrepresentation. And out of them all has come the Romish conceit of a "*Limbus Puerorum*," a sort of milder hell, for the unbaptized children. But our Lord's words on this occasion were the same as when He certainly spoke of that Kingdom which He had established in the world as the appointed ministry of salvation to His redeemed.

It would be apart from the meaning and purpose of the Gospel to tell us any thing of the provision which God has made for the preservation and development of the life of quickened humanity in those to whom the Gospel has never been proposed; but it is plain to see how the moral life had decayed in all heathendom, ancient and modern, for want of the Church with its life-sustaining Sacraments and fructifying word.

In the following passage St. Augustine lays down broad and generous principles in regard both to Baptism and to Conversion, which should have preserved his own and succeeding generations from much of the technical narrowness of his own theology. Speaking of infants who cannot believe, and of the penitent thief who was not baptized, he says:

"By all which it appears, that the sacrament of Baptism is one thing, and conversion of the heart another; but that the salvation of a person is completed by both of them. And if one of these be wanting, we are not to think that it follows, that the other is wanting; since one may be without the other in an infant, and the other was without that in the thief: God Almighty making up, both in one and the other case, that which was not *wilfully* wanting. But when either of these is wilfully wanting, it involves the person in guilt. And Baptism indeed may be had where conversion of the heart is wanting; but conversion of the heart, *though it may be where Baptism is not had*, cannot be where it is contemned: for that is by no means to be conversion of the heart to God, where the sacrament of God is contemned." (Cited by *Wall*, Vol. I, Ch. 15.)

It is delightful to see how a great truth when fully conceived, throws its cheering light not only through large spaces, but into corners and caverns where hard questions and painful difficulties have entrenched themselves in gloom and darkness. The Incarnation—the quickening of humanity through the human nature of Christ—is the one transcendent mystery of the Gospel, which but reappears in varied forms in all other mysteries, in the Divine Word, and in the Sacraments. Against this fundamental fact of Christianity the hearts of men have stumbled in all ages, wherever and however it is exhibited.

To help us to *apprehend* this profound mystery—not to enable us to *comprehend* it—for then it would cease to be a mystery, and would be less than the least of God's manifold works of wisdom and power, but to help us to apprehend and believe this mystery of our salvation, the Scriptures have exhausted the powers of human speech in presenting the same truth in varied forms, and by the most striking similitudes.

To this effect is the 6th Chap. of St. John, in which by the similitude of Himself as bread from heaven, upon which men feed, and it becomes the nourishment, the strength, and the very substance of their bodies: by the similitude of His flesh and blood to be eaten and drunk, our Saviour announces the intimacy and reality of the union between Himself and His redeemed; and that the spiritual life of humanity is derived solely from this union; and that salvation and eternal life depend entirely upon the continuation and consummation of this union. Precisely the same cardinal truths of the Christian religion are presented to us in other forms. Christ says, "I am the door; by Me if any man enter in he shall be

saved." "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." St. Paul says, "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." (Eph. v. 30.)

The Sacrament of Regeneration, the New Birth of water and of the Holy Ghost, represents and effectually seals the same glorious mystery in one Divinely ordained form in which God and man meet together as co-actors in a solemn covenant of adoption and grace on the one hand, and of faith and fealty on the other.

The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ is the Divinely ordered expression and the effectual seal of the same adorable mystery, in which God and man again meet together; man as the faithful and penitent recipient, God as the Almighty Giver of the life of His Son, thus continuing, strengthening, and perfecting that union between Christ and the believer which is the only life of humanity, the only hope of salvation.

It is mortifying to know that this last mentioned Divine provision for the life of man, for the nurture and growth of the children of God until they come to "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," has been perverted by superstitious folly into a monstrous fable, insulting alike to God and man, by which Religion has been degraded almost to the level of Fetish worship, and Christianity placed in direct antagonism with those very faculties of men by which alone its own truth can be perceived and recognized. The varied and beautiful imagery of our Lord in His discourses together with His own blessed Sacrament, expressing a sublime and glorious mystery, are thus changed into a revolting figment, which overturns the nature of a Sacrament, and frustrates the whole meaning, purpose and teaching of the Divine instruction, and of the Divine institution.

The gross and carnal fable of transubstantiation invents a miracle as useless as it is profane in place of the Divine miracle of grace intended by the Sacrament. For observe, the natural effect of bread and wine is only to nourish our bodies. But consecrated by the Holy Ghost their *ordered Sacramental* effect is twofold; first to be the *effectual seal* of our personal union with Christ; and secondly, to be the channel to convey to us Christ Himself to be the spiritual nourishment of soul and body.

For this mighty miracle of grace, superstition substitutes her poor, pretended miracle, and affirms that the bread and wine have

been changed into the natural Flesh and Blood of Christ. But the natural effect of flesh and blood is only to nourish our bodies as bread and wine do, so that after all this sacrifice of sense, reason, Scripture and the common meaning of language, this gratuitous miracle has not advanced us one single step beyond the simple use as food of unconsecrated bread and wine. For the Divine institution, *under this representation of it*, consisting simply in the supposed conversion of bread and wine into flesh and blood, and our feeding upon them, there is no place in this pretended mystery for the Sacramental union with Christ, which the real mystery was intended to symbolize, continue and strengthen. Even with the aid of the hypostatical union, with all its possible, and in this connection, revolting consequences, you get not beyond this, except by abandoning "the letter" which truly in this case "killeth" the most profound and glorious mystery of our Religion.

It is painful to have to write or to think of these consequences; but it is an unhappy necessity to answer men according to their folly. Allow to these men the pretended literal meaning of the words of institution, supplemented by all the effect claimed for the hypostatical union in this transaction, and the result is merely what the communicant has received, *as food for his body*, the dead or living Christ, the flesh, blood, soul and Divinity of the crucified and risen Saviour. But where is the place in this process for "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine," as the true Sacrament provides? All the power and glory of the Divine institution are expended and lost, under this theory, in providing a little nourishment for the body, and in the *mere subjective excitement which the thought of such a repast may occasion.* The real spiritual benefit is thus reduced to the very lowest point of the Zuinglian fancy.

To attain the true purpose and meaning of the Sacrament, to make it the communication of Christ to us, to dwell in and consecrate our whole nature, the Romanist is compelled to rely upon a truer and higher meaning of the blessed words of institution than that poor pretended literal meaning out of which his monstrous fable has been constructed. He must add to this letter that killeth a belief in the power of the Holy Ghost consecrating the supposed flesh and blood to their instituted purpose and effect, to nourish both

soul and body—to be the communication of very Christ to us. This supernatural and glorious effect—the real meaning of the institution—is altogether beyond and aside from the mere reception as food of the Flesh and Blood and the whole person of Christ. And in the real Sacrament ordained by our Lord, according to the plain and obvious meaning of the words of institution, Bread and Wine are consecrated to this very supernatural and glorious effect. So that this weary circle of folly and stultification leads to no end, accomplishes no purpose, except to degrade religion, and to be used as an instrument for the degradation of the human soul.

We have spoken of transubstantiation as founded upon the alleged literal meaning of the words of institution; but it really seems to be an abuse of language to call that a literal meaning of the words which does not express their plain and obvious meaning, according to the ordinary forms of speech.

The necessary construction of human language conveys spiritual and abstract truths by words derived from the material and sensible images. The mystery of the Eucharist is in the real meaning of the words of institution. The so-called "literal" acceptation of those words does not properly involve a mystery, but is simply a violation of the elementary principles of language, an insult to the Divine Speaker. For Christ used human language in its ordinary forms, addressing it to human intelligence. The words were used to convey a certain meaning, in accordance with the most common form of human speech. Men say they will humbly take these words in what they call their literal meaning, whatever contradiction it may give to sense and reason. But in doing this they take the words senselessly, and *leave out the meaning.* The words are as plain, and correspond in character with many other words of the same Divine Teacher, as "I am the door;" "I am the vine;" "I am that bread that came down from heaven," referring to the manna in the wilderness. The literal meaning of all these expressions is no mystery, but simply senseless and contradictory. The unfathomable mystery is in the plainly intended meaning, not in the literal meaning of the words.

The mystery is, the union of Christ with us—begun by the Incarnation, continued and perfected in each child of God by this and other means of grace and spiritual growth. The mystery is, Christ giving Himself to us when He gives us bread and wine, con-

secrated to represent that Body and Blood which with our whole nature He assumed for our sakes. The mystery is, Bread and Wine consecrated to be the *effectual seal*—the instrument, therefore—by which He conveys Himself to us. The symbolism in that Divine mystery is, that Christ is as truly united then to our souls and bodies as the consecrated elements are to those bodies. It is amazing that sensible men will obscure this great truth by a perverse taking of our Lord's plain and simple words. The Jews, who were offended by the great mystery first disclosed to them by our Lord, in the conversation related in the sixth chapter of St. John, took not His words in the gross and carnal sense now contended for by some. The communication of the life of Christ to men—thereby uniting them to God—was the profound and puzzling truth which they gathered from those words, and which inflamed their hearts with madness. This is the fundamental fact of Christianity, the one pervading mystery which is continually reproduced in various forms all through the institutions and mysteries of redemption.

One obvious effect of the sacramental form of this mystery is to recognize and declare the essential freedom of the human will in the economy of salvation. For those innocents indeed who are not permitted in this world to arrive at age to know and to choose between good and evil, God Himself makes the choice. By virtue of the Incarnation He purifies them by His Spirit from the taint of sin, and saves them from the peril of damnation. But all others must choose for themselves, *according to their varied opportunities.* Life and death are set before them. Where the gospel is preached, that life is manifested—distinctly showed forth—in Christ. Life through union with Christ! Death out of Christ—death separated from Christ! The sacraments provide the means and the opportunity of making this choice, sensibly, palpably, beyond the chance of doubt or misgiving. They are outward acts which all the senses witness, which all around us witness. By the right use of these sacraments, we abide in Christ, and are nourished by His Spirit. More and more of His life is imparted to us, and we live by Him. But, if we neglect and despise these sacraments, then we as truly despise and reject the union with Christ which they symbolize, convey and perfect. And then, according to the economy of grace, the life of Christ

originally imparted to us as the means of our probation, is gradually withdrawn, the moral pulse beats with feebler stroke, the Spirit warns in fainter tones, the conscience loses its sensitiveness and becomes at ease, and presently, the self-destroyed soul is as the limb severed from the Body, as the branch broken from the Vine fit only for the burning.

The relation of the great fact and mystery of the Incarnation to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as well as to Baptism, needs to be carefully studied now, when crazy extremists even in our own communion are putting forth such wild utterances on the one hand, and on the other. The Puritan faction vehemently proclaims that it will never cease to "AGITATE," until the words, Priest, Altar, and Sacrifice, those essential words expressing the elementary principles of all religion, are expunged from the Prayer Book. On the other side a few fanciful Romanizers, boldly adopting the most objectionable phraseology of Rome, or at best translating into dogma the impassioned rhetoric of some of the later Fathers, are learning to speak familiarly of Christ our Lord as "the victim" upon the Christian Altar, taken by the Priest into his hands, offered, and sacrificed. One of these silly theologians in a late communication in one of our papers, affirms, that "Christ is present on the Altar as the victim and sacrifice offered," by the Priest. The men on either side who use such language, who on the one hand would fundamentally alter the Prayer Book, or on the other grossly falsify its meaning, are lightly paltering with their consciences, when they profess to adhere to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of this Catholic Church.

The term of late employed by Dr. Pusey and others in England, to express the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, calling it the "Real Objective Presence," is capable, indeed, of a good sense, as expressing the fact that it is of more than a mere *subjective influence*, that Christ communicates Himself to us in that Sacrament. But it is to be feared that the majority of those who may be induced to adopt this peculiar form of speech, are incapable of the logical discrimination which will enable them to use it in this safe and Christian sense. The English author of "The Kiss of Peace" and the writer whose words we have just quoted, certainly have not this power of discrimination. The former uses this very term to prove that transubstantiation is true, and the actual doctrine of the Church of England.

We have already shown that the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is a higher, holier, and nobler truth than the word transubstantiation can express. To speak literally of Christ as a "Victim" on the Altar, to be offered in sacrifice by the Priest, of course involves a profanity which may be well enough named by this hacknied word. Leaving this word and the notion intended to be expressed by it out of the question; we wish to expose the folly of speaking of Christ as a Victim upon the Christian Altar by another method.

A competent knowledge of that LAW *which is universal reason*, will teach us that the talk about Christ as the "Victim," or about any "Victim" on the Christian Altar, is an entire departure from our Lord's institution.

A POSITIVE INSTITUTION like this Sacrament exists as an entirety. You cannot change or divide it. It subsists as a whole or not at all. Hence in the Romish-Church the Laity do not receive this Sacrament. For half a Sacrament is an impossibility. The positive institution must be observed according to its terms, or it has no existence. It is a nullity. Now the reception of the consecrated Bread and Wine by the faithful is an integral, essential, and component part of the Sacrament. Without this completion the positive institution of our Lord has not been complied with, and has no existence; all that went before fails of its effect, and is as if it had not been done. Christ is really present in the Sacrament, but only where the Sacrament is complete, when the elements are received according to the institution. Then Christ gives Himself to His trusting child. To talk then of a VICTIM upon the Christian Altar is worse than heathenish nonsense, for the heathen have a "victim" upon their altars, and we can have none. Christ fulfilled and thereby abolished all animal and expiatory sacrifices upon the Altar of the Cross. The only sacrifices possible upon a Christian Altar are first the Alms of the people and the fruits of the earth. Bread and Wine representing the faith and charity of the offerers, this is our thank-offering, our Sacrifice of praise. Then, secondly, when the elements are consecrated to their instituted purpose and meaning, they are again offered to God in their new and Holy character, by Priest and People together, both as a Eucharistic and as a Commemorative Sacrifice, of the whole meritorious passion and effective interces-

sion of our adorable Redeemer. The elements so offered are on consecrated *to their instituted purpose*, viz., to represent the Boc broken, and the Blood shed, and to be the vehicle by which tl living Christ will communicate Himself to His people receivir these elements. But Christ is not in the elements, is not a Victi upon the Altar. The appointed purpose of the consecration the elements is that they may be received and eaten. Previous this reception the consecrated elements are but a Eucharistic ar Commemorative Sacrifice of the one Victim, "in His own persc offered up (or sacrificed) once for all," as St. Augustine told long ago, when he expressed the folly of supposing that a Sacr ment of a thing is the thing itself, because it has properly tl name of the thing. But the Sacrament is not yet complet Christ is not otherwise Present up to this point, than as He Present in all Divine offices, as the effectual Mediator and Pries "The real Objective Presence of Christ," if we prefer to use th easily misleading term, by the very necessity of the institutioı can be only IN THE PARTICIPATION OF CHRIST by the faithful r cipient of the consecrated elements. For then only is the Sacr ment which Christ ordained complete. Then only are the term of this positive institution complied with, and its meaning accon plished. Then only is it the Sacrament of THE BODY AND BLOC OF CHRIST.

ART. VII.—OUR DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

IN wonderful contrast to the busy idleness of our ordinar church world in every city, and to the almost changeless round routine working which one may find in the great majority of ou country parishes, there is no brighter, braver, grander picture tha the Mission work which we have begun for God and His Church,— a work cautiously undertaken and assumed, and yet with prope ventures as the glorious work of all God's soldiery. They wh search it, will find it a work put upon all, and one which is carrie on under tried leaderships to a better daily vigor.

The theme which we have set ourselves in this Article is th Work of our Domestic Missions. It is by consequence in part th

history and working of the "Board of Missions," the authorized and honored agent of the Church of God. The manifold richness of our subject in all its aspects, may well stagger us at the outset, but, while we shall write in all plainness of speech and honesty of truthfulness, we shall not deal with it except as ever loving children of a Church which is, to us no ideal, but yet "the Jerusalem which is from above, the Mother of us all." We at once disclaim then, all intent to offer any plans of how all the work undertaken by the Church and carried out by her, according to her best judgment, might be better done. For that way of dealing with our task we shall ask the pardon of any who may expect of us suggestions of new plans or ways of reaching future work, or any intentional fault-findings with the work which has been attempted in the past. We have no such purpose.

Our readers must also pardon, here, one word in behalf of that other branch of our *whole Work*, which equally with Domestic Missions, belongs to all and every soul among us,—we mean those Foreign Missions which we have undertaken, and which, if it please God, we shall yet undertake. We cannot, we must not allow this other work which God has put on us, either to languish, to be less, or to be lacking in our hearty and more earnest support. Nay more, just so soon as we shall cease, which God forbid, the plainest work of a Missionary Church, in carrying "the Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God" to all heathen ignorance,—our every work at home will grievously fail of its highest possible results. We may have many successes. We may gather congregations, and institute Dioceses in the new populations of our wonderful heritage in Territory and People. But, we shall fail of that *whole* Work, which can never mean our idle asking that the kingdom of our Christ may come, when we, who are taken into Light by the Mission-Christ, leave any, by our wilful neglects in the darkness of Heathenesse.

We hope we shall be distinctly understood, therefore, that in commenting on our Missions *within the Jurisdiction of the United States*, and, in advocating as we mean to do with all our might, their right to our every effort to help them forward, to increase their efficiency, and to make them even better attempts for God, than they are now, we do not mean to set them in *opposition* to our Foreign work, as better work, as better done, nor yet as more

worthy all and any help. If any word of our's could help our Foreign Missions, we should be as ready to try our best for that part and branch of our whole duty, as we are glad to do what we can for the Home field, which is equally the duty of every baptized child of God.

Therefore we shall pass by past controversies. We look back to-day upon these ephemeral contests with a sorrowful wonderment at all their unwisdom, and with the knowledge, got at great costs, of all their hurt and stay of God's own work; and yet, with thankful sight of all that He Alone has wrought for us, in the midst of so many distracting difficulties, and against such seeming odds. Mere success is, indeed, no true criterion of the truth of any cause, nor, is unsuccess God's gauge of its rightness. But, such success as God has granted us, in spite of all or any discouragements, is surely powerful reason for more earnest, more perfect, and more thorough attempts. Contrast our beginnings of existence immediately after the Revolution, with our position in 1870! Measure the thoughts, and hopes, and prayers, nay the wildest dreams, or most prudent calculations of our fathers of seventy years ago! We stand to-day, a "little one," even yet; but, in an increase, and by an advance which are at once solid and lasting. Immigration has added its thousands and tens of thousands to the Roman Church. Our real gains by this means ought to be, we have no question, greater than they really are. But, in the experience of many among our Clergy, the English, Scotch, or Irish Churchmen who come over to this country have shown as a mass, not only a thorough indifference to the Church, but gross ignorance about it; while we have looked in vain for fruits of that new energy and influence which have been claimed for the Anglican Church in the last thirty years. It has not shown itself in the people who make themselves known to our Clergy. On the contrary we know no class of people whose need of instruction in the plainest truths of any form of Christianity is greater than theirs who claim, as *English-Church people* the offices and charity of our clergy and people at their own convenience, or, are content with most thorough neglect of the Church and of God. Our gains are not from these, but from people of our own training, from converts continually made, and by the power of that constant, quiet, steady Mission work which we have done throughout the length and breadth of

our whole field. There are doubtless duties which we owe, and which have been too negligently looked after, to the great numbers of our immigrant Anglican brethren, and yet, we think we have the right to *demand*, that they shall be sent to us with somewhat better training, with some better knowledge of their own religious duties than what we find among the most of them. We shall yet hope to see among our English immigrants as a class, some higher estimate of their faith and duty, than we have thus far known.

Our real history, we mean that history which we have now in mind, reaches back to our first efforts at any Organization. When the several States, which under English rule had been distinct colonial governments, became independent, it was not unnatural that the Church in each State should regard itself as a separate and distinct body. Hence, Conventions of delegates assembled from time to time—each Convention referring its action to its Parochial constituents for an adoption or rejection, in a way which would no doubt surprise those among us who do not know the difficulties which beset not only the general organization, but the organization in "States" with which we are now so familiar. The beginnings of our "General Conventions" were not accidental. In 1784, some of the Clergy of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, met on business in reference to a corporation which had been chartered in each of these States under Colonial government. In two meetings held, one at New Brunswick, New Jersey, and the other in New York, it was proposed to hold a further Convention in 1785, which might discuss the possible better union for common purposes of the scattered peoples who had been members of the Church of England. That Convention met as agreed upon, as its Journal reads (we quote from Bioren,) "Journal of a Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina." It is needless to say that this Convention did not "represent," or legislate for, the whole Church in the late Colonies. It made no such pretence. It had representatives, or delegates, from the several *States* named in its Journal. Nor was it until 1789, that the States in New England sent "representatives" or agreed to the Constitution as proposed.

What we shall call the "State Theory" has had continual

sway in all our action from the start. It disappears from the "Constitution" of the General Convention in 1838, but holds practical rule until this hour. The General Convention of that year made a new era, upon paper, in the theory of our Diocesan and Mission work. From that year on, we do not read of the "Church in any State," but, of "the Church in any Diocese;" and yet Dioceses have continued to be co-terminous with the States, while all possible divisions of Diocesan States required territorial limits, beginning at 8,000 square miles, until we learned, by sad experience, that square miles and a given number of "self-supporting" Presbyters and Parishes were the very last estimates which we ought to make for Diocesan or Mission work. For some years, we stood by in almost helplessness until State after State was organized into Dioceses. We put impossible tasks upon the Presbyters who were bold enough to accept the Episcopate. We gave them jurisdictions which demanded more than the men who accepted them could fulfil, and not content with that, we put still heavier burdens upon men already overborne with wearing labors. We put what we called missionary work upon the shoulders of Bishops, to whom we had already given Missions in Empires. In the quiet ease in which we write, we read their "reports;" we find their gigantic work in all forwardness for God, and we feel untold shame at what we made them do, with a supreme honoring heart for "Iron men" who took greater burdens than God put on them.

We must note here several results of that theory on which we comment. We have unquestionably suffered from its allowance in the past. It might seem possible for us to learn better foresight in the future. We deal only with the facts, the outshow of the theory to which we object. It came to be thought (1) that there could only be one Bishop in each State, unless under the form of an "Assistant Bishop." Then the State *might have two.* No one dreamed of more than two; (2) that there could be no Diocese, unless there were first of all a State; (3) that there could be no Bishop, unless elected by what we called the Diocese of such or such a State;* (4) the organization of a Diocese co-terminous with the

* The Bishops at the first had the Official Title, "The Bishop of the P. E. Church in the Commonwealth of A. or B."

State has been thought necessary for union with the General Convention, and thus with the P. E. Church. (5) When the Church in any State was organized into a Diocese, it ceased to be Missionary Jurisdiction. Hence, the action of the House of Bishops in 1838, in answer to a memorial from the "Dioceses of Georgia, Alabama, Florida and Mississippi." The Bishops declared, "That they were not authorized to nominate Missionary Bishops for organized Dioceses."

For many years, in consequence of these strange facts, we had Dioceses without any Bishop whatever, founded by the few Presbyters who might be resident in the State. These gentlemen were encouraged to "organize," with the often very faint hope that at some time future, their number might reach the required sum of men in orders and "self-supporting Parishes," which would enable them to elect a Bishop. All honor to the men who did their part in the foundation of each and all of our Dioceses! All shame to the dastard fear which has seen too quick advances at any time, by any measures, wherein our pioneers have honorably sought the pushing out of God's work with all their powers, and have done their best, *in pursuance of our Law.* Time, however, is proving more clearly every day the mistake that underlies the "State Theory," and the practice which has grown out of it. No real restriction since 1838 has prevented the *first* foundation of any Diocese in the States, or Territories, with such a limiting of its claim to jurisdiction as would seem to be in reason. The *bar* of square miles and reference to *Division* of existing Dioceses. We should be the last to make any objection to the boldness which undertook the first fields of work which were assumed by those who founded any of our "State Dioceses. We grant, again, most readily and thankfully, all those efforts, which we doubt not were in mind, if they had not be in hand. And, we wonder to-day at all impatiences at the seeming slowness of the work reached to; at all undue lamentations from the men who in every period of our history have set right noble examples of *any* work to those who dare to blame

We left our whole work under a defective rule until 1835, a mistaken and crushing law, or practice from that day until and expect impossibilities from the men—the Bishops and whom we send out to Mission Work. We censure them for (!) when the real failure, if there is any, is due to a supine-

ness and a niggardliness which have no excuse in our multitudes who know nothing of our work—the field and its workers—except by necessary hearsay, or cannot know, because those who ought to tell them, never do it.

From very early in our history, the language has been used which one finds to-day in Canon 13, Title 137 of our present code: "The jurisdiction of this Church extending in right, though not always in form, to all persons belonging to it, &c." And yet, in the effort to give this jurisdiction *form*, the purpose has been balked. If one considers the interests of our whole mission field since 1790, he will find one chief mistake, perhaps, in the allowance of the creation of "State" Dioceses without any intention and without the power to proceed at once to the election of a Diocesan.*

The House of Bishops acting on their right to create missionary jurisdictions, divides *Territories*. In all its action it has proved the gain which comes of giving Missionary Bishops, and thus any Bishops, a small jurisdiction. We should have been saved many a bitter, and perhaps endless controversy, if that House, or some other competent authority had been empowered to divide "States," and thus create Dioceses. Powerless by the side of State and Diocesan organizations, the Bishops have been patient. They have waited. To-day we have reached, perhaps, a better understanding of their "necessity," as well as knowledge of their being officers, which are very "expedient" in the work before us. We have been slow to learn the lesson.

We have already seen what "States" were represented in the first of our general Conventions. We give in a note the dates of

* Some outcry has been heard of late as regards a possible increase in the number of *Bishops* without any equivalent of voting power in the "House of Clerical and Lay Deputies," in our General Convention. This clamor, where it is honest, seems to have been made in an almost intended forgetfulness of a history, which the writer, for one, regrets. For quite a long period we have had "Dioceses" which were entitled to place in the lower house, which did not, or could not elect Diocesans; and which seem to-day anomalies more extraordinary than all history but our own could give. They were "Dioceses," as we called them, who never had a head; which were not *missions*, and which by our law could not be administered, except by their own consent, by any Bishops sent out by this Church, but, which, as "Dioceses" or Churches organized within States claimed and used their right to sit in Councils, as if they were perfect organizations. We commend the facts to the recollections of any who have forgotten them, in their zeal against the increase of that Body of men—the Bishops—to whom we owe untold honor for most arduous and telling work, and without whom we may be quite sure "this Church" would never have made its present place of commanding influence for God.

the several "organizations" from 1789 to 1835, together with dates when these Dioceses obtained Bishops.* Of the older original organizations, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Vermont received a Bishop in 1811, who had title as Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, Massachusetts having already lost two honored occupants of her See. New Jersey had no Bishop until 1815; while Delaware waited until 1841. The journal of General Convention for 1835 gives a list of twenty-two Dioceses, nine under supervision, with only sixteen Bishops.

This summary will show our actual condition when our first Missionary ventures—the first that deserve the name—were made in the election (in 1835) of Bishops with Missionary jurisdiction. We do not mean to say that when Drs. Hawks and Kemper were elected, no mission work had been done. Attempts had been made. The way had been opened. More than once a Missionary Episcopate had been suggested. The Missionary Society had not been idle. It was thought prudence to elect Dr. Kemper for Indiana and Missouri, while Dr. F. L. Hawks was chosen for the State of Louisiana and the Territories of Arkansas and Florida. We confess our unfeigned regret that Dr. Hawks did not accept a post for which we think him beyond question better fitted than any man else either at that day or since. Who can say what power he might have had to match the march of his brother Kemper in the West!

In 1838, there seemed to be most urgent reasons for new effort in the way which had been so well begun. The Bishops of Connecticut and Tennessee, and the last especially, had been doing all that could be done in the then new and growing South. Dr. Hawks had refused the work. Bishop Kemper was asking to be sent further West. He was *almost* ready with his "Dioceses" of Indiana and Missouri for admission into "Union" with the Gen-

* North Carolina,	organized	1816,	Bishop	1823.
Maine,	"	1820,	"	1847.
Georgia,	"	1823,	"	1841.
Mississippi,	"	1825,	"	1850.
Tennessee,	"	1828,	"	1834.
Kentucky,	"	1829,	"	1832.
Michigan,	"	1832,	"	1836.

Ohio and Illinois have a history of their own.

In 1835 the Roman Church had twelve Dioceses, eleven Bishops and two coadjutors.

eral Convention. He had made no despicable visitation in the South.

The Roman Church had already her See at St. Louis, (created in 1826), and at Vincennes, Indiana, (created in 1834), each of them since divided.

At once the General Convention is met by difficulties. They cannot legally send Missionary Bishops into "organized Dioceses," and there were no less than nine already "in union" without Bishops; while Florida, Illinois, Indiana and Louisiana were ready to ask admission, each except Illinois without a Bishop, and by the fact of their "organization" precluded by law from administration by "Missionary Bishops." The Convention did what they could. They divided their Missionary jurisdiction by a degree of Latitude 36½. To Bishop Kemper, (consecrated for Missouri and Indiana in 1835,) they assign all North and West of that line. They elect a new Bishop (Dr. Polk) for their Southern jurisdiction, and consecrate him with permission to extend such provisional services in "the organized dioceses as they may respectively request." Indiana as an organized Diocese is authorized to continue under the Missionary jurisdiction of the Bishop of Missouri. To meet another difficulty they pass a canon allowing an "organized Diocese" which cannot, or will not elect its own Bishop, to ask the nomination and election of a Diocesan by the General Convention.*

In 1841, the Missionary Bishop of the South-West resigned his mission to become Bishop of Louisiana, and we put his jurisdiction under charge of the noble Otey of Tennessee until 1844, when Dr. Freeman was consecrated "Bishop of Arkansas and the Indian Territory." In the mean time we had refused the then independent Republic of Texas an Episcopate, leaving it in charge of the already overburdened Overseer of the South-West. At last, in 1859 we granted a Bishop to this Empire of 602, 432 square miles, which was ready as a foreign Mission, in 1841 to ask for three Bishops. Florida waited from 1838 until 1851, another illustration if any were needed in addition to what we have already cited

* But one election, we believe, was made under this Canon; that of Dr. C. S. Hawks for Missouri in 1844, and the Canon was forthwith repealed. As another example of our delays, Missouri becomes a Diocese in 1839, and receives a Bishop in 1844; Indiana the older Diocese (1838) waits until 1849. The instant they became "Dioceses" they ceased to be, technically speaking, Missionary jurisdictions.

f the follies of delay, the strange blindness which makes a State f almost indefinite square miles a Diocese, and of our using too w men in the office and work of Bishops in the Church of God.

It will be manifest from the way in which we have partially reewed our history, that we think *Bishops* essential to the highest ission-work, or to put it upon the only other possible ground, at ast *expedient.* We knew already in 1841 what a Missionary Epispate could accomplish from all the labors of Bishops Brownell and tey; by what Bishops Kemper and Polk had done. A Missionay Episcopate had been our hope almost from the start. As far ick as 1808 the General Convention had it in mind. The wishes nd hopes of sixty-two years ago would seem to have poor fulfilent in our record. We do not mean in the men who since 1835 ave been sent into this longed for work, but in their *number*, and the almost stolid indifference with which our laity has stood by, sight and knowledge of the vastness of our undertakings and f the glorious self-sacrifice and devotion which have been spent pon them. The Bishops of this Church have never been idle, nor an we put on paper the untold labors of many among our Clergy. ut the laity have never seemed to take to heart with prayer nd alms, that work which it has been their's to do and help. hey have been slower in all enterprises for God and His Church han in all secular ventures. A decade passes by, and in the wonerful vigor of our growing empire, we find States instead of Teritories; vast populations, swarming millions, ever pushing out to ew States and Territories of which we men had no dreams in oyhood. In the influx of all nationalities, if we may believe the ecular press and the activity of the Marine service which brings imigration to our shores, to be greater in this 1870 than ever before, nd in the advance to new Frontiers of our own sons and brothers, e should be startled into questioning how we shall deal with them or God and Christ. We march to be Masters of all our Territoy and all our duty with a strange slowness. If we see before us ll that duty, we are slack in its undertaking, unwarily asleep here all the world, for worldly aims is quick, alert and wakeul.*

* We might learn from our Roman brethren some lessons in determination to possess he field, and in vigorous effort untrammelled by the Diocesan theory which we have so ong allowed to hurt our every advance to grander life. They have three Dioceses in Ohio, three in Wisconsin, and two in each of the States of Kentucky, Michigan and In-

We glance once more at the history of our field. In 1835 we sent out Dr. Kemper, and he returns us Missouri, Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas. After the resignation of Dr. Polk in 1841 we give him a co-worker in Dr. Freeman (in 1844) for Arkansas and the Indian Territory south of 36½° latitude with supervision over our missions in Texas. In 1859 Dr. Kemper resigns his jurisdiction to become Diocesan of Wisconsin. Dr. Kip is consecrated for California in 1853 and Dr. Scott for Oregon and Washington in 1854. Dr. Lay in 1859, succeeds Dr. Freeman, and Dr. Talbot in 1860 becomes Bishop of the North-west in place of Dr. Kemper. Both have since taken other duty. Thus from 1835 to 1860 we send out *seven* men only for work in a field into which the Roman Church in the same period has sent more than double that number. If then we give impossible tasks to seven men, it may be well for us to ask, why we should look for better results, especially when we have shown little willingness to help, and where we have given reason for such despairing wails at forgetfulness and helplessness as came from the patient heart of Dr. Scott of Oregon. We have no hope that we shall reach more than the few to whom our words may come. Would to God that such words as ought to be written, spoken, heard, might be sent out broadcast into every household with power to rouse all hearts to a knowledge, and to an enthusiasm at which the world may mock, but which God can give and rule, and teach us how to use. The cries for help, for remembrance, for heart, which our Missionary Bishops are sending out, should have answer among us all, and from every one. They should have better, nobler, more generous, more befitting answer than we have given in the past. None need be cast down when our Masters are full of courage. Surely we may stand by in wonder at their patience, and undimmed zeal; and mark their work, and bless God for granting ever-renewed youngnesses to hearts which no failures can discourage, no forgetfulness dishearten in the work which the Most Holy Jesus is pleased to give and oversee, and which, at last, He will Himself measure and reward.

We go out to new attempts at this year of 1870; attempts be-

diana. These sees with their twelve Bishops, stand side by side with our five "Dioceses" and nine Bishops, four of whom are "assistants" to Bishops, "unable" to perform their duty.

gun in the ten years just gone by. We put new names, new jurisdictions, on our lists; Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Nevada; with Oregon and Arkansas, in new hands. We begin in these last ten years, the whole of these ever new undertakings with new men, who in new power may teach us the majesty of what they are given grace to do, and our own glory gotten out of their great labors. We send no longer two men only, to a task which may well seem Herculean, but the six, who, to-day, demand from us, all prayers, and the help in words of comfort, and deeds in money, which have been madly withheld from men who commanded all honor wherever they came, and left marked evidence of their personal presence in their seemingly least efforts in every jurisdiction to which we sent them. The veteran Kemper is yet among us, with his coadjutors Lay and Talbot, each one undertaking a Mission work, which no sane man will despise, in Dioceses wherein there is no restriction upon labor, save in its change, to them, from indefinite "square miles," to the hard task of our Diocesan Episcopates. We give below the Jurisdictions of the six who, God be praised, are banner-bearers in the place of two in our responsibility. *

We must put on record here our earnest protest against a form of choice which in the past has been too common among our people. We mean their choosing to do more for Western Missions than for our equal duty in the South and South-West. Side by side with our Western increase from 1790 until to-day, few remember the quick returns from all the South, when they see the answers crowding in from the West. † They have forgotten our

* Arkansas and Indian Territory,	Square miles,		52,198
Oregon and Washington,	"	"	161,274
Colorado, (including Wyoming and New Mexico,)	"	"	330,000
Montana (including Utah and Idaho,)	"	"	388,000
Nevada, larger than Colorado,			
Nebraska with Dakota, larger than Colorado,	"	"	100,000

The last reports of the Domestic Committee will give the number of the men employed—whether in organized dioceses, or in the Territories which are Missionary Jurisdictions.

† We give in parallel columns the dates of "organizations" in the South and West, organizations made by law, and until no more "States" were left in Southern Territory for that strange process. The table proves no backwardness to be forward in their work, their only legal work, on the part of our Southern Brethren. Our increase in Western organizations of Dioceses has shown fruit since 1850. We contrast the two, not to make more bitter the least remains of any bitterness, but in duty to our history,

encouraging organizations to which, by law, we have refused all help, except such as might be spared from other work by the Bishops of Tennessee and Arkansas. We spent our thought and money on a jurisdiction, from 1835 to 1860, which no doubt demanded all we had to give and more, but we have not given as we ought, nor had courage to give favor to Missions, which for all we know, might have prevented the Civil War out of which have come so many disastrous fruits. Our Southern needs have grown to such very abjectness, that we know no part of our whole field which demands a nobler showing of every liberality. We are the more glad to press these home to every heart, in the hope that any word we can give will prove to the newly consecrated Bishop of Arkansas, that he is not forgotten at the outset of his bold undertaking. It is a boldness wherein he has examples which he will not, and need not be ashamed to follow. It is a work in which, beforehand, we can but hope that he will have better help, and less forgetfulness than his predecessors, and the most earnest prayers of all who have learned to carry Missions to the throne of God.

Dr. Talbot once gave a lesson in geography which few will forget who had to take it. We are not competent to attempt any such lesson. Our studies do not call our thoughts that way. We should almost despair at all the "reading up" which would be our duty if we made attempt to learn what, we who write, could not be taught in 1835, the day we learned our last in geography to begin our ignorance in languages. We question whether any words about "square miles" and Territories of boundless extent, would touch the hearts of men who see no strangeness in the oft told tales of our National reaching to grasp all future, all Westward Empire. Our people take these lessons as of course. The mere suggestion

and in the knowledge that this history proves our *delays*, and the results of mistakes which all regret.

North Carolina, 1817.	Ohio, 1818.
Mississippi, 1825.	Maine, 1820.
Georgia, 1832.	Tennessee, 1828.
Louisiana and Florida, 1838.	Michigan, 1832.
Mississippi, 1839.	Illinois and Indiana, 1838.
Texas, 1849.	

Will the reader compare this Table with one given before as to the time when these several organizations were Bishoped?

of any doubt would seem, and is, the whisper of mere folly. But, we need, not only the few, but all, to be taught how we shall conquer, take and keep all Empire for the Lord. We need to be roused from quiet conviction that things will settle down in time to right themselves, and to know our duty in helping to that end.

The Mission-work left behind in the older Dioceses is not finished. In all of them, there are posts which ought to be filled, and which might be supplied, if the men among us were set to work, who say they have none, and that they cannot get away. It is no part of our present inquiry to touch upon the singular fact, that in the continual demand for more Clergy, there are 216 men unemployed, reported nevertheless at the last General Convention by their Bishops as men "in good standing." We keep that fact for future use and for some thorough search into reasons which gave men orders, and yet have kept the best among them, or any, in any idleness. We think those reasons, if put on paper, might compel our having a somewhat smaller list of unemployed Clergy, and tell a lesson of rebuke, which, in view of undoubted facts, we can teach to our many employers, and to the men who would rejoice to be decently employed.

Those of us who know our history, in practice, are not ignorant of the difficulty with which Diocesan Missions are sustained; how often they are made the excuse for neglects of any general work. We push back to reach another evil. Each Parish is too busy with its burden of being "Self-supporting." It has thought it a first duty, and made it its only duty, with utter forgetfulness, or ignoring of yet another—in the world-work which God instituted. There are, it may be, some among us who feel some natural doubt, whether the mere Parochial selfishness which is so common, and which, after all, means so often very little, will be accepted as Church Work by the Master as worthy of the reward of the Corn and Wine of Plentiful wages.

With an income which our people have power to spend, which surpasses all that God lends to any other denomination of Christians in the land, our *gifts* in return to Him have been often less in fact, and always, less in proportion. Our most boasted ventures have two differing aspects. They may seem like silly cowardice to the rashness which sometimes passes for courage, or they may be measured as undue boldness by any who dare nothing for God. We

think them out-showings of a marvellous courage, when we meas all the facts which show the ways in which our people have prov they could be churls—or else the truer fact, perhaps, that th have never yet, in fullness, been told their whole duty, their pri lege and their power.

The Missions of this Church have grown from the littleness our beginnings, to WORK in thirty-four States and Territori Twenty-five organized Dioceses had been helped in October, 186 Then came those Empires where God means we shall plant t Cross—the Territories (and the word means very much), where no present foresight can foretell the history; but, which must hav some history wherein each baptized child of God has place an d power. We may deck these regions which God grants to us, with temples builded to His Honor; we may send out men to step by equal marches with the advances of all our civilization; we may pour out money for all holy uses, and we shall but begin our duty to the Christ, who is our Master, to the men whom we send out to untold burdens, deeds and hardness; and to the claim we are so ready to push, that we are no mere sect or self-appointed Missioners, but the host of God's sent Messengers to fill up His measure of all Faith and Work for God and Christ.

What shall we say of all this Field? We stand aghast at all its immenseness; at all its demands. But when we are troubled at these "difficulties," there rises up the sight by faith of Him who gave the world-wide commission, there comes to ears that will give Him hearing, the voice that spake as never any in all history—Lo I am with you always.

ART. VIII.—BISHOP BURGESS.

THE life of Bishop Burgess was one of character rather than of incident. It had few changes, few marked events. Its outward history might be comprised in a few lines. Such lives afford little material for the biographer. Such lives are hard to delineate, especially, if, as in the case of the first Bishop of Maine, the lines that define the man are delicate and light, and the effect of the picture must arise not so much from an accurate representation of feature as

from a faithful bringing out of that mysterious thing which we call expression. A few slight touches make the likeness, and not the broad drawing of prominent forms, however exact; and thus it sometimes happens that a coarse picture may, by a happy hit, convey a better idea of the original than the laborious and skillful product of elaborate art. The one may have expression while the other may have become expressionless in the effort to be minutely perfect. And then, what friend of him who is "no more seen" would not value the coarse portrait most? Bishop Burgess had great individuality; he was a man by himself; he was not *a* man but *the* man. To make the man live after death as he lived in life was no easy thing.

The book before us has accomplished its object better than most persons dared to anticipate from the peculiar method pursued in making it up; and we do not know but it will become, and ought to become, a precedent and a model in future instances, and serve to originate a new variety of religious biography. When the method was first suggested, those who were asked to contribute to its execution, as well as others, thought it could result in nothing but a mass of incongruous shreds and patches, that would be any thing but satisfactory; and while they felt that the life of such a man ought not to be without some permanent record in the world, and therefore did not feel at liberty to refuse their aid towards the production of one, they gave it with reluctance, and dared not look for a very favorable result. But on the whole the book answers its purpose well. Bishop Burgess lives in it again; and as, to make the dead live truly in the minds and conceptions of men is the proper end of biography, it is a far truer book than many similar works that have more continuity.

George Burgess was born in the city of Providence, Oct. 31, 1809, of a sturdy Pilgrim stock not weakened by the Scotch descent of his mother. He was trained up virtuously, but not in that communion of which he was destined to become a conspicuous ornament. He was studious and conscientious. His fondness for books was insatiable; and his attainments in knowledge, beyond his years. Yet he was not prematurely grave, and when a boy was a boy. He entered Brown University in 1822, and graduated at the early age of seventeen. Of his own choice and deliberate convictions about this time he became a member of the Protestant Episcopal

Church, and a communicant of St. John's Church, Providence, of which the late venerable Dr. Crocker was then Rector. Amiable, moral, blameless, remarkable for that exact truthfulness and uprightness which characterized him through life, he had learned the great lesson that "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to God's mercy," "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," are we saved; and henceforward he sat at the feet of Jesus in humility, and found strength and comfort and hope only in the Cross. He soon, after an abortive trial of Law, entered upon the study of Theology under the direction of Dr. Crocker; and then spent two years in Germany, and a short time in more extended travel, and upon his return to this country was ordained by Bishop Griswold, June 15th, 1834. He was the faithful, successful and beloved Rector of Christ Church, Hartford, Conn., for thirteen years. In 1846 he married a sister of the present Bishop of California. And the following year he was unanimously chosen the first Bishop of Maine, and was consecrated in the Church so endeared to him by years of faithful and pleasant labor by the venerable Bishop Chase, one of his predecessors in the charge, Oct. 31st, 1847. He took up his residence in Gardiner on the Kennebeck river, and this continued to be his home for the remainder of his life. Here he united the Rectorship of the Parish with the duties of the Episcopate. The direct communion with human souls, for which a parochial charge furnished an opportunity, he greatly loved; and yet he had a high estimation of the duties of a Bishop in the Church of God, and would never let them willingly be slighted, or made second to any claims whatever. It was quite marvellous that for every duty of a Bishop, in his Diocese and outside of it, he was always ready, and always contrived to meet every call for his services in any direction, while yet no man's Parish was more minutely, variously and thoroughly cared for than his. Thus his Clergy, while they could not but admire his wisdom and fidelity in his own higher sphere, felt that they had also in him a model in their own.

At last under his multifarious and incessant labors his naturally robust constitution began to give way. The last time, so far as we know, that he publicly appeared in that Parish, which, as the field of his early ministry, he always tenderly loved, was when he came to attend the funeral of Bishop Brownell; and none who saw him

; he stood by the coffin of that venerable man, whom he regarded ith a truly filial reverence and affection, attenuated, worn and 'eary with a journey from which he had had no opportunity to est, and listened to his loving, beautiful, discriminating eulogy, 'ill forget his appearance. At last he was persuaded to seek estoration in a voyage to the West Indies, yet only so as he might ingle work and usefulness with refreshment; and there, on ship-'oard, in a painless change that might be likened to a translation, 'e yielded up his soul to God.

Such are the few facts of a very even and uneventful life, and n these we have been insensibly drawn to dilate somewhat beyond he bare recital which alone we intended. And as a history it is ertainly a meagre history; and all we can say of it is that it falls a to the category of those quiet, tranquil lives, which, though they ow through the world without commotion or agitation, are never-heless its most useful and precious lives, its truest ornament and glory.

The character of Bishop Burgess is by no means easy to ana-yze. Its symmetry and completeness, if we may be a lowed he word, its rotundity, make it difficult to lay hold upon and reak into parts. And yet he was not without strongly marked eculiarities: if he had been, he would have been an insipid man; hich he certainly was not. Out of these peculiarities grew his ults; which were but these peculiarities pushed to an extreme a strong and tenacious will. They were mixed up in such due portion as not often to startle; and yet, looking back upon the ished whole we can see that they became errors—a harsher term n this there really was nothing to deserve—and no friend of will complain of us for attributing these to him; for they know we are speaking not of an angel but of a good and holy *man.* e was a man of extraordinary industry. Indeed in this re-; one cannot easily find his equal. He wasted no time. Its s and odd pieces that did not belong specifically to any particu-ing were all appropriated and diligently used. It was in this hat, in connection with a memory as remarkable as his indus-e accumulated such wonderful stores of knowledge, and had ery occasion things new and old ready for use. And yet he was a ready man, and ready because full, he never found general acquisitions any excuse for carelessness. What he

did, with his great accumulations, he did carefully as far as circumstances would allow. He was willing to take pains with things, and did not, like many possessing not a tithe of his resources, rush hastily into situations in which they only display their own incapacity. Yet this incessant industry left not sufficient spaces for relaxation and recreation in his life; and in the end he broke down under it, grew prematurely old, and, to human apprehension, shortened a term of service that might have been lengthened with great benefit to men. To husband one's powers as well as to employ them is the dictate of wisdom; but of this the excellent Bishop never took account. Or rather, as there was no bound to his willingness to do, he insisted on matching his endeavor to his willingness.

This indefatigable industry was strikingly seen in his devotion to sermon-writing; and yet in the extent to which he carried it he can hardly be regarded as a safe example. It may well be doubted whether any man can be found who at his age had written so many sermons deserving the name; for it was quite impossible that a man of his intellectual power and vast accumulations could produce for a sermon anything that was not worthy of the title. He wrote very pure, transparent, musical English, whether it were prose or poetry. And with his deep knowledge of divine things, he could not fail to be instructive, edifying and profitable. But he insisted on preparing two sermons a week whether he was to use them or not, and always had a store on hand in advance of the want. There was oftentimes an absence of that glow which is requisite to make a sermon forcible and striking. It could not but be so with any man. To shine, indeed, was never his aim. But one might hear him many times without supposing him adequate to those exhibitions of power as a preacher of which he yet was capable.

Bishop Burgess' memory has already been mentioned as an adjunct of his industry. It was in him a very remarkable faculty. "He was," as one of the writers in his Life remarks, "a walking magazine of facts." This in many men might be slender praise; for the memory that simply gathers facts to lie loose and barren in the mind is seldom allied to great qualities. But in Bishop Burgess it was praise. For in his mind, facts became alive, and were turned to useful account. They became the basis of arguments and conclusions, and in carefully considered generalizations told

upon the minds of men with efficient force. He knew how to use them most adroitly, and make them a fulcrum for the lever of an irresistible logic. His "Last Evening" and his "Pages from the Ecclesiastical History of New England" are striking instances of this.

Bishop Burgess was ordinarily grave and calm; yet there was in him an inexhaustible fund of humor. He had a keen sense of the ludicrous, and this sometimes came out in bursts and explosions of laughter. What was laughable in a man or his actions he would in the freedom of friendly conversation speak of with merriment, but never with satire or ill-natured ridicule. No man was more free from sanctimoniousness and austerity.

No character was ever more remarkable for truth, uprightness and honor than his. He abhorred guile, dishonesty and meanness. He had an especial dislike of all looseness and slackness in pecuniary matters. "Owe no man anything but to love one another," was the spirit of his life in this respect, and the rule of his judgment. Perhaps the strength of this quality in him unfitted him to judge with perfect fairness of men who in this particular were differently constituted from himself, and gave him at times an appearance of severity, or even of harshness. But there was no bitterness in his soul; and the men that he could not but withstand and condemn, he would have gladly endeavored to benefit if he might. But the conviction he had of the evil of a thing, and the sense of his own integrity in opposing it, kept him back from entering into explanations, or assuming an apologetic tone. Indeed, it may well be doubted whether with his nature he could understand that it might be expected or expedient. He did what he thought to be right, and what men might think about it was never considered; not that he was indifferent to human opinion, but because he thought nothing about it. A very large-hearted and large-minded man he was, and in consequence walked in the world with more freedom than men are wont to do.

Bishop Burgess' Churchmanship was always a problem, with many an enigma. In order to understand it one must know the man very thoroughly, and it may be doubted whether a man who was himself a decided partisan could understand him at all. To such a man he would look like a mass of contradictions.

He belonged to no party, and we doubt whether he could belong

to a party. It cost him no effort to keep aloof from party. It would have cost him much effort to be of a party. He just lived by a sort of moral necessity as if there were no such thing. Particular acts and measures he judged by their own merits, he cared not what quarter they came from. The circumstances and associations under which he came into the Church and the ministry threw him at the first among Low Churchmen, but he never was a Low Churchman. This became more evident as time wore on; and some of both sides thought there was a change. He was seen to be farther from one side; but if one looked at him carefully he would also see that he was no nearer to the other. Some men boast that they are not party-men. Generally when there is such a boast it is a mistake, and the boast is the unconscious covering up of the contrary. He made no such boast simply because he cared nothing about it.

But there are deeper things than parties in the Church: there are schools of thought, of which parties are by no means accurate developments. And as it respects these schools of thought it is not very difficult to tell where Bishop Burgess was. He was a frank man, and of his opinions he made no concealment. If the writer may be permitted to drop for a little his conventional impersonality, and certify, he will have some things to tell here. The points at issue in the Church between schools of thought—rationalism is a new matter—respect the Sacraments and the Ministry. In regard to the Sacrament of Baptism, the word Regeneration is a sort of crucial test. We say the word, for multitudes, we believe, receive the thing who reject the word. We certainly do not think it well to treat them as the men of Gilead did the Ephraimites at the fords of Jordan, but we do wish they would learn to pronounce better. What Bishop Burgess thought about the word is plain from a letter to a young Clergyman printed in his Life. He believed that men are assured of the grace of God in Baptism: and he held that Regeneration is the proper word to express that grace, because he thought it so used in the Scriptures. The writer, taking the liberty mentioned above, was once expressing to the Bishop his sense of the mischief of a too careless and promiscuous administration of the rite of Confirmation. His reply was that the children of the Church have God's grace pledged to them, and that, therefore, when young persons of correct lives

and fair intelligence desired Confirmation of their own free will, he saw no occasion to ask further questions. It was not his habit to do so.

In regard to the other Sacrament, his views were equally decided. The writer once passed a night with him, at the house of a common friend, who entertained at that time pretty strong views on the subject of the Real Presence. A lively debate between the Bishop and our host ensued, which was prolonged far into the night, and ended, as such discussions usually do, with leaving each "of the same opinion still." The Bishop accompanied the writer to his home, and almost immediately took down a volume of Bishop Seabury's sermons from a shelf, and read the following sentence:

"They continue bread and wine in their nature; they become the Body and Blood of Christ in signification and mystery—bread and wine to our senses: the Body and Blood of Christ to our understanding and faith—bread and wine in themselves; the life-giving Body and Blood of Christ in power and virtue; that is, by the appointment of Christ, and through the operation of the Holy Ghost; and the faithful receive in them the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice and death to all spiritual intents and purposes." "There," said he, "That expresses my belief exactly;" and added, "Bishop Seabury was a very clear-headed man."

As to the Ministry, there is no doubt but that Bishop Burgess did believe in the validity of non-Episcopal ministrations. But valid is a somewhat ambiguous word. A thing may be valid in source, or valid in effect. The Bishop believed that the ministrations of non-Episcopal ministers were by the blessing of God made effectual to the salvation of souls, and that when the sacraments were given and received in good faith under such a ministry, the substance of the faith being retained, they were true sacraments, and accomplished for men the purpose of the sacraments ordained by Christ Himself. Thus, to bodies erroneously constituted, he thought there was a churchly character imparted by the mercy of God. And, perhaps, if men would carefully analyze their views, there might not be found many who would feel it safe to positively affirm the Bishop's opinion incorrect. He had no doubt at all of the divine authority of Episcopacy; and he had no faith in such a makeshift as that which distinguishes between the obligation of things established by Christ's word and those appointed by His inspired Apostles. The historical certainty of the Apostolic succession he thought it almost a disparagement of a man's sense

to deny. That his ideas of validity outside of the Episcopal succession, went no farther than the limited admission described above, is certain. And that he was utterly opposed to any practical recognition of ministries "outside our own Church," is plain, from the fact that when asked by his pupils in theology whether it was proper for them to receive the Lord's Supper from such ministers, his answer was a prompt and emphatic "*By no means.*"

No one deprecated the formation of voluntary societies in the Church more warmly than Bishop Burgess. The reviewer merges himself again in the witness to say, that at the meeting of the Board of Missions that followed the formation of the Church Missionary Society, the Bishop came to him and said, "THIS BOARD OUGHT TO DO SOMETHING TO CHECK OR REGULATE THIS MOVEMENT. IT IS THE WORST THING I HAVE EVER SEEN IN THIS CHURCH." The opinion was expressed that nothing could be done. His answer was "We ought, at least, to try; there must be a way." He had rarely appeared so worried and disturbed. After the services, he renewed the subject in the street. "THE SPIRIT OF THE MOVEMENT," said he, "IS SCHISMATICAL, AND IN SCHISM IT WILL END." God grant he may not prove too true a prophet!

But it may be said, that afterwards, to some extent, he recognised and aided these societies. Let it be that he did. Here, again, the peculiarity of his position is to be taken into account. He opposed their formation, but being formed, he wished they might be useful, and he was willing to help them to be. The charge of inconsistency he cared nothing about. He would rarely take the trouble to explain himself. And, he thought, that putting these societies at too great a distance was precipitating the schism he feared.

Was, then, Bishop Burgess a High Churchman? Not at all. He would have rejected the name promptly. He did not belong to a party, not by determination, but by instinct. It was not in his nature. He looked on men and measures with an impartial eye, and judged of them according to their merits, without caring what this man said, or that man said, whether the one party liked it or the other. But, if the question be: To what school of Christian thought did he belong? What were his theological affinities? The answer, we think, is sufficiently plain. He was thoroughly evangelical; but not evangelical after the fashion of some, who are fain

to monopolize the name. He loved the Gospel and he loved the Church, and to them he gave his life, and sealed his love with his too early death.

Our task is done; would that it were better done. The tribute is poor; if love and reverence could have made it rich, it should have been rich. There stands before us a large-minded, large-hearted man, wise, just and pure, generous, unselfish, a true servant of God, a true lover of man. He sleeps in Jesus, but he lives in many souls. He rests in Paradise; may we, who linger a little while behind him, be partakers of his rest; and when the Lord shall come, wake with him to the resurrection of the just!

ART. IX.—ROME AND HER COUNCIL.

The Pope and the Council, by JANUS. *Boston*, 1870.

The Church's Creed, or the Crown's Creed? A letter to the Most Rev. Archbishop Manning, etc., etc. By EDMUND S. FFOULKES, B. D., etc. *Eighth Thousand, London.*

The Roman Index and its late proceedings. A Second Letter to the Most Rev. Archbishop Manning. By the Author of the Church's Creed, or the Crown's Creed? New York.

OF all things, whether divine or human, ever set in the life currents of the human race, and therefore liable to human waste or wealth, the Latin Communion, or as we say Rome, is among the most wonderful. Unless she had forgot her high estate as a branch of the Catholic Church, when she usurped rule over Christendom with an almost sublime audacity, and announced dogma from a throne which the facts of the great Catholic ages deny to her, we should also call her the most venerable. Confronted by her own incessant additions to the Creed of the Faithful, and measured by the stability of Oriental Christendom, we certainly cannot name her immutable. Yet measure her as we may, by the facts of antiquity or of history, and the accusing voices of Saints and Councils, no reflecting mind can regard otherwise than with a thoughtful sober anxiety, her present activities and position

towards Non Papal Christendom. To this measure of attention at least, she is entitled from all men, philosophers or Christians, who study the laws of human advance, and understand those subtle forces which tinge civilizations and become the life-blood of decisive movements controlling the world. For admitting that the Catholic Church on earth in her visibility, is that channel fashioned partly out of human substances, along which flow the incessant tides of the Holy Ghost, to purify our race from sin, and to vivify it with the strength of eternal life, and there is that in the variable and human aspects of the Latin Communion, to challenge a most thoughtful inquest and sentence. Bred at first in the catacombs and smitten into fresh vigor by the red swords of gladiators, who slew the Confessors of the one Faith of the Cross, and climbing on its knees with constancy, in a might inspired of its martyrdoms, ever upward towards supremacy over heathen Rome, at last, as God willed, the Roman Church acquired a truly imperial throne. Yet somehow almost from the start it became too much an *αυτόχθονος*, a child of the Roman soil, to display that temper of pure Catholicity which the Holy Ghost alone sends down from Heaven. Rome herself a congeries, in her sinister devotions, of all heathen superstitions, exhaled a malaria, which very soon benumbed the delicate and sensitive heart-strings of the Faith. Human weakness in the new Hierarchy of Peter yielded to the temptations of Pontifex Maximus and his flamens celebrating their magnificent but godless Ritual, until the Roman Church, affronted the simplicity of the Bride of Christ with a ceremonial materialistic, sensuous and heathenish beyond Law and against Truth, as they are defined and taught in Council and Gospel. A kindred inspiration from below, led the same Church, to attempt to outrank Cæsar and the Civil Empire, with an ecclesiastical imperialism to be extended over all countries and all ages, of which the Patriarch of Rome was to be the new Cæsar, more august than Augustus, and more enduring than any dynasty assailable by Goth and Vandal, or defensible with sword or legion. This new imperialism, contrived by the Tiber and under the very shadow of that imperial throne, it conspired from the start to subvert, and whose overthrow it has sought in the name of Christ, with the bloodiest swords and the bitterest intrigues for nigh two thousand years, is seeking this day, in a boldly gathered convention of men it calls a Council, to

extend its sway, and undertakes to put men's very souls in thought, affection and outward act under its own irresponsible control. It is clear that only an infallible God can safely or wisely do this, and to His will, plainly expressed, all pious men will yield themselves. It therefore follows that this new imperialism administered by this spiritual Emperor must be infallible, like God. The Pope desires a new dogma of infallibility. By it he becomes logically and practically God. Unless his holiness has erred in his Latin syllogisms, he is entitled to stand towards all men in the place of God.

In order however to accomplish such stupendous results, the Patriarch of old Rome and his coadjutors, during the ages have had great labors to undergo. The earliest and least worthy of them had for their point, to win not a Catholic but Roman headship over those ancient, and sometimes through their imperial relationships, powerful centres of the Church—the thrones of oriental Bishops. To this assault upon primitive and fundamental privleges confirmed by ancient use and Councils, the Churches of Constantinople, Ephesus and Alexandria, did, and do oppose many most ancient and Catholic defenses and protests. From the Church in the East, Rome has never gained admission of her imperial claim, though put in a thousand Protean shapes to suit the circumstances, while this very day the Oriental Communions with unstammering but regretful lips repeat their primitive warnings against that arrogance of Rome which claims lordship over equals, and which Catholics both East and West declare to be the root of heresy and schism. In the West, Rome has had a somewhat different and upon the whole a more laudable task. For since as regards Western Christianity, Rome was the elder daughter, and the Faith came from Rome to the West, and not contrariwise the Latin Communion, carried the Cross to the western heathen and imparted to them those spiritual treasures of which it had been made a steward. With that Cross it carried its own imperialism and imposed it on the converted. Under the Latin sway, the western and northern races, robust beyond the East and South, in a certain granite inflexibility of principle, and in a piety which has about it not oriental dreaminess or asceticism, nor even the Southern flame of Egypt or Numidia, but a high pure constancy and aroma, like the loyalty of a natural law, and the purity of violets fed from snow, wrought out their destiny. Then came the

Reformation which broke from great races the yoke of the La imperialism. For that Reformation, whatever good or bad was it, we hold Rome clearly responsible. The Reformers had be nurtured at Rome's breast, and were such as she herself made the Enslaved by Rome, against the law of Catholicity, both Pap and Catholicity perished out of the hearts of infuriate men to wh madness their unworthy mother had ministered. Two things here clearly affirmed concerning the Reformation. 1st, that si its age the great northern races have gone on their way, brok away from Rome, and have wrought out great destinies in ar arms and wealth. 2d, that for the last three hundred yea Roman action has been in the West, limited and determined what she alone regards as the great Protestant heresy, and schis Of her life in these three centuries, it remains to mention th despite any compulsory moderation, she may at times have show from the days when she summoned to her aid the Jesuits who su ceeded in repelling the tides of Reform, with as bold and audacio self-sacrifice as men have ever seen, to this present hour Ro has held to and intensified both her heathenism and her imperia ism in a most marvellous and ill boding fidelity to her ancient si against Christ's Church. Her heathenism reveals itself in th new pomp and ceremony, wherewith she celebrates the mysteri of the Childlike Gospel of our blessed Lord, and in all such offe ses against the Faith, as her novel dogmas concerning the Immac late Conception and the Assumption. Her imperialism crowns i self in the demand which the present Patriarch of old Rome i making in the most singular and stupendous request ever made be fore men, viz., Papal Infallibility.

In this formidable endeavor after dogmatic Infallibility, th true genius of Rome appears. The historic path of the Papacy has this singular quality in it, that whoever takes it cannot stand still without destruction, but must always be moving on. Therefore when in these days the acute minds of Christendom are inquiring with renewed force as to the Papal claims, and are crying out with a clearer voice than ever before was heard by the Roman Curia that they are spurious and convicts in the Court of History, as having been traitors to the truth, Rome, instead of Confession for the truth, affirms against truth all that the world denies. And with a recklessness of one who

perils all things on the throw of the dice, Rome thus pressed by modern civilization intensifies her arrogance and proceeds to match against the world an old claim put into a new dogma of Infallibility. To this policy assent doubtless the majority of the Latin Communion—all those who confound the Papacy with Catholicity—and the most resolute and thorough ecclesiastic tempers, who finding themselves implicated in an ancient system, whose ruin would overthrow themselves, elect to fight boldly for victory or annihilation. In this undertaking, we need hardly remind our readers, the Jesuits, from the start the very janissaries and fanatics of the Papacy, take the lead. This great dominant party are so far right, as this, that any serious check to their aspiration, would be the beginning of the overthrow of the whole Roman system. For the last twenty-four years this party have been steadily gaining ground, and have brought to bear a most grievous weight upon the necks of those honest and free souls in communion with Rome, who while loving with a great zeal the Mother who bore them, are so loyal to her as to desire to see her rid of the Papal yoke, and made in truth a pure and stainless bride of that Christ with whose religion even Popes and Jesuits may not lightly meddle. The fate of men like Lacordaire, Lammenais, Montalembert, Hyacinthe, Ffoulkes and a host of others attest the supremacy and severity of the zealots of Papacy.

The men in Communion with Rome, Catholics but not Papists, have learning, piety and history on their side, but they lack numbers, and unless protected by Divine favor, or the temporal interferences of secular power, are likely to be crushed down into silence and oblivion. Without doubt the vote of the Roman world is vastly on the side of the most extreme ideas.

In such a posture of affairs we should expect to find in this age the vast power of the Papacy absorbing all control, and grinding down between the upper and lower mill-stones of its imperialism and its heathenism all men who will not lie prone and abject before its almost illimitable arrogance and usurpation. And that such is the fact singularly enough has been lately demonstrated by men, not only in Communion with her, but who were once members of the Anglican Church. Mr. Ffoulkes, whose name appears in the two pamphlets whose titles preface this essay, was bred a Churchman, and like many others, disgusted by the Hanoverian lethargy

which oppressed a Church, in no slight thraldom to a State in which a Jew or Turk might hold political sway; and thinking to find at Rome what had been better kept at Canterbury, as true Peace and Faith, became a pervert from his spiritual Mother, and submitted his neck to the Roman yoke. At most of these men, considering their sincerity, their suffering, their aspiration, and above all their mistake, the wise Churchman always looks through his tears; and with some of them we know the old altars and the old loves and the old graves of their own dead speak out of cold but gentle lips words that wound them to their very souls. We should not judge from his writings that Mr. Ffoulkes' nature was of the pathetic order, but he shows himself at least to be an outspoken honest Englishman, who hates sham and lies not a whit less because they hide under a priest's gown, and who does not believe that even a Pope can reverse or override with impunity a law of God. He is a Catholic who thinks with Innocent III, "Falsitas sub velamine sanctitatis tolerari non debet," and with St. Bernard, "Melius est ut scandalum oriatur quam veritas relinquatur." Yet for opinions so novel to the Roman Curia he has fallen into great misery. His crime seems to have been partly this, that he, having like an honest man been studying Church history and discovered, what most honest scholars have always said, that the Popes had been the great corrupters of the Faith, and proved in his pamphlet, "The Church's Creed or the Crown's Creed," that Pope Benedict VIII under stress from the Emperor Henry II had corrupted the Nicene Creed and taught men heresy through the whole West—said so. For this his book was put in the Index and himself condemned by the Communion he had sought.

Moved thereat in his English blood, which his share of the Papal virus seemed unable to emasculate, and stung as a brave true-souled man should be by a drivelling dishonesty in the garb of piety more fitted for eunuchs than men, he has written down his thoughts in another letter to Archbishop Manning, concerning the way the Roman Curia has treated him, He proves in his own case, with a sincerity which carries conviction, that he was not only condemned by the Congregation of the Index unheard and in violation of its own organic law, but that even Dr. Manning, the Roman Primate of all England, was not only not allowed to administer justice upon him, but was compelled against justice, and under circumstanc

which would sting a tender conscience to a great agony, to proceed against him as a criminal. He proves in a summing up of the acts of the Roman Curia on English soil, how that Court has ever been the disturber of the loyalty of English Roman Catholics toward the Crown; how it forsook and left for long years the unshepherded fold in England without pastors or overseers; how it oppressed with systematic injuries the stateliest spirits of its own Communion and those who had paid tribute of the severest labors, provided they had loved truth better than Rome, and would not forget that they were Englishmen under the Papal livery; that it, as we shall elsewhere and hereafter see, systematically destroys the power of local Bishops with its Vicars Apostolical, and absorbs all power into the Roman Forum to receive Italian justice; and that it does these and many other things not in even a decent, heathen way, but in a fashion which reminds one of a stiletto and the fatal cup, and the poisoned Florentine Eucharist, and of whatsoever is malarial and deadly in the atmosphere of morals.

We confess to have been greatly moved by certain very plain revelations touching the Roman Curia contained in this book. For that even a heretic may have some regard for honesty and a schismatic delight in fair or at least decent play, even the veriest janissary of Rome may easily grant; and we have paid strict attention to Mr. Ffoulkes' sayings:

"Could there have been imagined any policy more truly Roman than this, to withhold a power from our Bishops which the laws of England would never interfere with their exercising but on the contrary would uphold them in exercising over their respective flocks so long as it was wielded with justice; and to bind them hand and foot to the sentences of a foreign Court, a position which could not fail to lower them in the eyes of their countrymen and may sooner or later bring them into collision with the laws of the Realm? . . . . Has Rome no faith in Bishops who have sworn allegiance to the Pope on their consecration and are responsible to him ever afterwards for all they do, that she cannot trust them to rule their flocks *except through the confessional* or administer justice to them in broad day-light, &c.? . . Here we see still after all that has been said and done by our forefathers in depreciation of it, victims to the same intrigues, to the same back-stair practices, to the same secret and irregular agencies that they were. . . These are no visionary sketches of my own. I am speaking of three notorious intrigues of late years, . . that I could not help knowing."

A Second Letter, &c., pp. 67–8.

We have learned for the first time in Mr. Ffoulkes' second let-

ter what that true priestly temper is which has in ages past created such stout infidels as Voltaire to curse not only all priestcraft but all religion with at least an honest mouth. For if anything in this world can madden a man loving truth above all, it is the spectacle of a priest and a non-combatant, professed to Christian virtues, wearing a priest's robes for a cloak under which he may work nastiness, and from under which in a safe time he may stab in the back a man with his hands tied. Now a priest so described would answer, we should say, to the treatment which our author tells us he and other English Romanists have been subjected to. The Puritan through his nose, might speak a very whining and fragmentary truth betimes, in a sincere love for his fanatical and monstrous religiosities; but such a man shows like an angel of light beside the sleekest priest or Cardinal who with abject eyes and a godly salutation of Christian peace carries a ready lie in his soul to wound with it a fellow-man as opportunity may serve. We cannot conceal from our mind that the flavor of the acts which Mr. Ffoulkes' second book narrates is neither clean nor healthy. It smacks of the South, and is redolent of Italian godliness. There is nothing bracing in the atmosphere of such transactions, and to go no further, in them one fails to find that robust manhood which the Northern nations alone esteem. The Roman Cardinals may have the bearing of ancient women in an inoffensive reticent demeanor, but the Roman Catholic religion must make of its Clergy *men* if it expects to retain respect among men. We close this part of our discussion of the present conduct of the Roman Church towards her own children, with a confession in Mr. Ffoulkes' second letter.

> "Our watchword," he says, "has been Rome or infidelity. . . But nobody who has ever confronted his neighbor with this dilemma can be dispensed from asking his own conscience the further question, 'Are Rome and Christianity convertible terms?' And this in spite of all my best wishes that they were, or might be, *I am unable in honesty to profess they are.*"
>
> *Second Letter, &c. p.* 75.

Such then in her internal economy is that Church which to-day disturbs "the orb of the globe" with her so-called Ecumenical Council. To deny her great influence upon men would be to give the lie to human experience. Rome is strong, but at her circumference, not at her centre. If Rome were to exhibit herself as she

is, and not as she desires to seem, she would have by a single act turned victory against herself. Taking advantage of that awe with which unfamiliarity always environs things kept in the solitude of sanctuaries vulgar feet never invade, and she has become venerable to many by her distance, and the studied seclusion of her Council-chambers. Then she touches with the outward actions of her circumference pliant minds into a veneration not due. In other words Rome puts close to honest hearts blessed verities, and in her secret conclaves practices knaveries. Ffoulkes' book shows it, and Alphonso de Liguori's Ethics defend it. Thus in all her more formal acts there is an outward dignity and patience which seem bred from an eternity of peace; but beneath so harmless a garb have often lurked, as the world knows, the most merciless inquisitors, and enemies of the purest virtues.

It is Rome then, this complex and sinister mixture of good and evil, so bland and yet so inexorable in request and domination, so silent in the forum, and yet so loud-mouthed in the souls of men, demanding even the sacrifice of manhood for her own weal, when necessary; this Church, which has the best nurses in a hospital or on a battle-field, and priests who care boldly in the midst of the deadliest epidemics for their flock; this Church, which in one spot nurtures peasants or Indians, or Tartars with the Latin mass, and elsewhere sits in honor at the gayest courts or feeds at the most luxurious tables; this vast and old establishment carrying on its ancient policy, which to-day confronts the world of the nineteenth century with the avowed purpose of conquering down all its loftiness under the shadow and service of the Papal tiara. It is a spectacle not more lightly to be regarded because it is so ill-omened.

Thus Rome stands a fortified camp, as it were within a circle of active enemies. That circle is inscribed in time by the whole of the human race, who are non-Roman. One arc of that circle—Heathendom—containing 700,000,000 souls, completes. Another arc is filled by the Greek Church, 70,000,000 strong, occupying the most ancient and venerable Episcopal thrones and living for 1,500 years, without notion of any change, and immutable as the desert, and full, as it sometimes seems to Westerns, of the peace of the dust of the graves. In the West, Protestant Christians, 120,000,000 more, complete another arc—men broken away from

Rome with an angry energy against all her claim: foremost of all, at least, in the visible sinews of great nationalities; erecting libraries that outrank all ancient ones; from the upper waters to the deltas of all rivers, disturbing their winding currents with the eager prows of their ships, and fretting all seas with the swift keels of commerce; speaking across oceans with the flame of the mysterious fire from heaven; moving in a giant's wrestle to conquer and acquire the treasure of the land and sea. Such is the world that confronts the cohorts of old Rome under a Cæsar that wears a tiara. How will he advance on it?

That is the very question which this present Convention at Rome proceeds to answer. The dominant party, and foremost among them, the Jesuits, affirm boldly that the Roman Church should not advance on modern civilization, to treat with it, or compromise, but to attack it and overthrow it. To accomplish this, they say, it becomes necessary to sharpen the wedge of the Roman phalanx with the invulnerable and overmastering point of Papal Infallibility, and to push that against civilization for its discomfiture. But what is this new and potent weapon, and how came it in the Latin arsenal? And what, moreover, is its actual force and metal, to be now paraded before the doomed enemies of St. Peter's privilege? It is to answer such inquiries that we now devote ourselves.

"The present doctrine of Papal Infallibility, in brief, is this, that 'The Pope carries on Christ's work on earth, and is in relation to us what Christ would be if He was still visibly present to rule His Church.' And as Christ cannot err, being God, so the Pope cannot err, and, therefore, whatever the Pope decides to be true, is true; to be faith, is faith; to be godliness, is godliness. As the Jesuit, Gretzer, said, at the beginning of the XVIIth Century: 'When we speak of the Church, we mean the Pope,' as Bellarmine has called the Pope 'Vice-God;' as other Jesuits have lately said: 'It is not enough for the people only to know that the Pope is head of the Church and the Bishops; they must also understand, that their own faith and religious life flow through him; that in him . . . is the power which strengthens and the light which guides them; that he is the dispenser of spiritual graces; the giver of the benefits of religion.'"—*Janus*, pp. 31–2.

So every true papist, according to the dominant public sentiment of the Latin Communion, is bound under pain of heresy, to

ld that the Pope is almost an incarnation of God, and that God mself having wound up the world, as a watch, has, as it were, ıe to sleep and left His Vicar in St. Peter's chair to rule and ninister the world as he sees fit, in a full and unerring wisdom ich ranks him, in fact, not as one of the Holy Trinity, but the ·ly Quaternity of Four Divine Persons, and One God, whose one on earth his Holiness occupies. From all which we dis- ·er that the old imperialism of Rome is now disposed to be satis- l, not with a mere unquestioned rule over mankind, but even ıtures to thrust God down from His sovereignty, to be controlled the realm of the human race, by the pleasure of that Roman ria, headed by an old man, who are not His creatures, but His sters. The position does not seem to heretics to be an over ıus one. Yet, it is perfectly intelligible, as our Jesuit overseers ıciously state it to us.

The question, therefore, very naturally puts itself to us heretics, o, in all our sins, have still retained some sort of reverence for › Holy Trinity, and have kept the traditions of the one salvation ·ough Jesus Christ and the one comforting of the Holy Ghost, Iow did this dogma, so outwardly monstrous in its insults to the ristian religion, come to be held by Rome?" We, therefore, look k, as Janus does, with our face towards the past, and ask of his- ·. And as this is so grave a matter, we examine historical facts utely. In primitive times, we find that Rome had not only not ıupremacy of the Church, but that again and again Churches · venerable, like the Asiatic, or the Egyptian, or the African, nly declined to follow the Roman lead, but upon occasion, ed against her, and led her. Thus, for the first four centuries, ·ils alone decided dogmatic questions. At the second Ecu- al Council, in 381 A. D., Rome was not represented at all. Siricius (384–398) declined to decide on a question of doc- but referred the whole matter to the proper Bishops. In the ·reat controversies of the first ages; namely, the question Easter, about heretical Baptism, and about the penitential ıe, Rome was overborne by the general sentiment of Chris- and her weak displays of arrogance speedily rebuked by ·r and equal Churches, with a very open condemnation. In n disputes, which disturbed the Church, Rome not only, ıg time, abstained from any prominence, but when she ough her Pope, Liberius, it was to condemn the Nicene

Faith, as now held by Christendom, and to favor Arius, in a disgraceful blunder, which has left, down through all the mediæval ages the stain of the tradition that St. Peter's Chair was once filled by an acknowledged heretic.

The same fact appears from the ancient Constitution of the Church. For in primitive times the Popes took no part in convoking Councils. All great Councils, to which Bishops came from different countries, were convoked by the Emperors, nor were the Popes even consulted about it beforehand. If they thought a General Council necessary, they had to petition the Imperial Court, as Innocent did in the matter of St. Chrysostom, and Leo, after the Synod of 449; and then they did not always prevail, as both the Popes just named learned by experience. They were not always allowed to preside personally or by deputy at the great Councils, though no one denied them the first rank in the Church. At Nice, at the two Councils of Ephesus, in 431 and 449, and at the Fifth General Council, in 553, others presided; only at Chalcedon, in 451, and at Constantinople, in 680, did the Papal legates preside." *Janus*, p. 63. And it is plain that the Pope did not then claim even the presidency of Councils, from the fact that Leo I sent his legates to Ephesus, although he knew that the Emperor had named not him, but the Bishop of Alexandria to preside. In fact, it is plain from history, that for the first thousand years no Pope ever issued a doctrinal decision, addressed to the whole Church.

The overwhelming argument against the Papal arrogance, derivable from antiquity, is made weighty with the concurrent testimony of those ancient Fathers, for whom, in words, at least, Rome professes reverence. In the first three centuries, St. Irenæus is the only writer who connects the superiority of the Roman Church with doctrine, and he in no such way as to justify her modern claim. All the other Fathers, East and West—Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, the Great, the two Gregories, St. Chrysostom, and the two Cyrils, Hilary, St. Ambrose, and a host of others, preserve an ominous silence about any such claim or right in Rome. St. Augustine, who has written more on the Church than all the other Fathers put together, in ten folios has only one sentence, in a letter, which can even be distorted into a support of the Papal claim. Again, the Patristic interpretations of that Scripture, which Rome, under the Jesuits, claims

to be proof of her vast majority, are all the same way. For instance, not one of them ever applies texts like Math., xvi. 18, John, xxi. 17, to the Roman Bishops, as Peter's successors. Not one of their commentaries which we possess—works of Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, &c., has even the faintest hint that the supremacy of Rome is the consequence of the commission and promise to Peter. Even the passage (Luke, xxii. 32) on which the Jesuits build Infallibility, was never held by the Fathers, who have discussed it (and there are eighteen of them,) to be anything more than a prayer to Christ, that His Apostle might not wholly succumb and lose his faith entirely in his approaching trial. Pope Agatho, in 680 A. D., when endeavoring to avert the condemnation of his predecessor, Honorius, for heresy, was the first to put it to a different use. We may close this section of our historical inquiry with the grave words of the author of Janus.

"Now, the Tridentine profession of faith, imposed on the Clergy since Pius IV, contains a vow never to interpret Holy Scripture, otherwise than in accord with the unanimous consent of the Fathers, that is, the great Church doctors of the first six centuries; . . . . Every Bishop and Theologian, therefore, breaks his oath when he interprets the passage in question (Luke, xxii. 32,) of a gift of infallibility, promised by Christ to the Popes."—*Janus*, pp. 75–6.

But how then in the face of Councils, Fathers, and the general drift of primitive Christendom, has Rome been able to build up such an edifice of Infallibility, as that which now so overshadows the Roman conscience? The work that it has taken seven centuries to perform, can be clearly distinguished even to the separate stories that compose the structure. Availing herself of that political supremacy which throned by the Tiber, was sometimes exercised in her behalf, and acquiring respect from others by diverse worldly or at least temporal considerations, it is not to be doubted, that from a very early age the Roman Patriarch did attain a certain pre-eminency among his fellow Bishops, whose thrones owed him in Catholic custom no subserviency. Upon this basis of honor, however acquired or measured, the Roman Court proceeded with more or less misnomer of honesty to establish its ecclesiastical imperialism. Its inventions against truth and Catholicity were neither few nor meagre, but are surprising for their multitude. It invented acts of spurious martyrs, fables of the conversion and

Baptism of Constantine; imaginary decrees of Councils committing greater trusts to Peter; letters of power that no honest man had written; histories of events that had never happened to give Rome at some new point advantage in some new struggle; Canons never received or heard of outside Rome; letters of Fathers like St. Cyprian altered; false lists of Popes set up; false documents touching pretended gifts of territory from Constantine; even a like letter of St. Peter to a heathen King, whereby there was something more for Rome; in short inventions which for their magnitude and number have never been equalled in either Christian or heathen ages. Thus the foundations of the Infallibility dogma were laid by different hands in different ages, so as best to serve Roman pride, and least to be detected in their dishonesty. In the beginning of the IXth Century, except in the addition of these falsehoods and their undoubted influence on the minds of an illiterate and barbarous age, no radical change had been wrought in the Constitution of the Western or Latin Church. But in the middle of that century, about 845, A. D., the Isidorian Decretals appeared, and at once the imperialism of Rome vaulted almost to the height of its sinister ambition. In very truth these Decretals were merely clumsy forgeries that could not endure for an hour modern scientific criticism, but in that age they bound the yoke of Rome on the neck of the unscientific and unquestioning West. The pretended to be certain decrees of ancient popes and synods, by which the whole Church of God was handed over bound hand and foot to the good pleasure of imperial Rome. The apparent object of the forger was twofold. 1st, to protect provincial Bishops semi-civilized lands, like those of France, from all external interference by state authorities, that is to create for the Church imperium in imperio, and a privileged class of ecclesiastics independent of the throne; 2d, to intensify the power of the Pope the aid of his Episcopal brethren. Whatever success this forge had with the rulers of the West in restraining their hands from Church, its result on the other hand came to this, that the Pc magnified by the falsehood, swallowed these same Bishops and their privileges in the capacious maw of his Infallibility, and a grew to deprive them all of their liberties. But when he had complished his meal on Episcopal rights in the West, he confron the civil power with a claim to its obedience, and proved

his same forgery, how in all time St. Peter's chair had controlled n an unquestioned right all thrones, principalities and powers. Thus with one lie he enslaved both Church and State in the West. Delayed however from the full fruition of its mendacity, it was not until Leo IX., (1048-1054) that the Papacy reaped full harvest of its crime against God. Under him the Latin imperialism whose aim was and is to centralize and convey all power to Rome conquered.

Gregory VII., in his own fashion, and by aid of new laws based on the Isidorian decretals, put into practical shape by the shrewd priest-lawyers he gathered about him, riveted in still closer links the ancient chain of bondage. Then in the middle of the XIIth century Gratian's Decretum, a book of Canon law in which all the falsehoods of previous ages in behalf of the Papacy, appeared as organic laws of the Church, ended for its own age at least all question of Rome's supremacy. Thus it had been accomplished upon the mind of the Western Church, that it was heresy, not to believe that the Pope was infallible, holy, and had right of excommunication over all Churches. It only remained to develop these new doctrines to their logical conclusions. This from the time of Alexander III. (1159-'81,) till now, the Papacy has endeavored to accomplish, by destroying all Bishops down to the level of Roman serfs, by causing all roads to lead to Rome, and all honor to proceed from Rome, and by absorbing all dignity and the fountain of all ecclesiastical eminency into Rome. To do this it has used the monastic orders, the perils of kings and the misfortunes of nations, the evil man's villany and the good man's piety in a strange unscrupulous career of intrigue, craft and cant; troubled by so-called Councils, by the vices of its own pontiffs, the inquests of honest men wishing reform, yet ever proceeding on its own line of policy and trampling down fact, history, human aspiration, and every thing but God. That it has failed with Him appears from that necessity which convokes this present Council, and that outspoken habit of Christian men to-day, who dare to tear away the veils behind which Rome hides her deformities, and to expose in the full glare of pure truth the ghastly and monstrous pretence of Infallibility, and the equally gigantic, and now historic falsehoods on which it rests. The dogma of Infallibility is not yet accomplished, and even Jesuits may fail to garrote modern civilization with their pet doctrine.

Having thus briefly traced from primitive times the way which the Roman Curia has followed in the enslavement of Christ's Church to her own imperialism, it remains in the next place to notice the handling which Rome gives her favorite doctrine in the present assembly at Rome. That she wishes to fortify this doctrine into a dogma to be as implicitly obeyed as any article of the Nicene Symbol and under equal penalties by all the Faithful, is so generally and in such wise affirmed, that we may take the fact as proven. But to us heretics, the way in which she advances to her point seems worthy of a Court that has based for a thousand years all its great governmental claims upon the most singular congeries of forgeries and falsehoods that ever challenged the contempt of the human mind. The Jesuits, children in temper of the Isidorian Decretals, and the Donation of Constantine, and of whatever historic unveracity may assist the absolutism of the Papacy, act in this present Council as masters of ceremonies, and of the situation. A subtle pressure from a thousand threats and hints scattered through Ultra-montane literature is brought to bear on timid or time-serving consciences, to oppress them with a dread of that easily offended Court, rich in the gift of Bishoprics, Vicar Generalships, and Cardinal-hats. The power of votes in a Roman Council has for a long time been studied and shaped by Rome in behalf of the present issue. The bold free minds of the Latin Communion have been confronted with the spectres of excommunication, a personal defamation that taints in the very grave; and the wrath of a world-wide hierarchy which stabs station, piety and learning not papal, with a smile, and destroys honorable antagonists with a semblance of the blessings of unity and peace. The internal economy of the Council, in the appointment of committees to prepare and shape certain ecclesiastic work, and the public introduction of it in adroit priestly fashion; the established laws of debate different from any other forum; the incessant manipulation of the deputies by a thousand soft but merciless hands of papal request; and above all its secrecy, impress onlookers with the idea that here the great imperial lie of the ages, is to be defended, not merely by draping it in the costume of truth, (for to that endeavor unswerving judicial history opposes itself,) but by chaining the lips of honesty, and strangling the throat of Catholicism with an Italian cord of Jesuitism and fraud. In other words this Council

has about it the air of a cavern damp and unhealthy, in whose secrecies assassins lie in wait, and from out whose shadows daggers may at any moment gleam and wound to death all not clad in the Papal livery.

Since then Infallibility finds itself to-day at Rome in such meet company, and concluding as we do from a survey of the situation, that the chances are vastly in favor of its becoming a dogma in the Latin Church, it occurs to every one to ask, what will logically result if this happens? In the first place it puts all human society and government under the Pope and gives to one man or God, as this dogma may define him, irresponsible and final authority against and over all human institutions, in politics, arts, literature and arms. It unthrones all kings and dejects all peoples under an Italian Curia with a somebody at the head of it who may be a Borgia, and is, according to the Jesuits, omniscient and omnipresent Deity. It says with the Jesuit Erbermann:

"A thoroughly ignorant Pope may very well be infallible, for God has before now pointed out the right road by the mouth of a speaking ass;" and with Cardinal Deusdedit: "Even if a Pope is so bad that he drags down whole nations to hell with him in troops, nobody can rebuke him; for he who judges all can be judged of no man."

It makes every Romanist a possible traitor to the laws under which he lives since whatever an Infallible Pope may at any time command him he must do under pain of heresy and excommunication. And as many Popes have heretofore, as with the German Emperors, claimed rule over all crowns, so must all future Popes make the same claim since one Infallible Pontiff cannot well contradict another. Therefore, to go no further, at any time after the promulgation of this dogma, it is competent, for any old man in St. Peter's Chair, surrounded by his Jesuits, to condemn Congresses, lyceums, public schools, all assemblies of Protestant Christians, all freedom of speech or print, any or all of our social customs, to put his foot on our necks and subject the whole American people to his irresponsible pleasure; and what is more all good Catholics are bound to aid and abet him. Was ever so monstrous a claim made by a mere mortal? Is it a wonder that all civil governments in Christendom know this dogma levelled against their existence? It brings back the Inquisition and the whole Papal scheme of Interdict and Excommunication. For though most men do not

know it, the Jesuit temper of to-day is in favor of extreme measures, and the control of modern civilization by faggot and rack and dungeon. The Vienna Jesuit Schrader has lately said:

"It is not only *minds* that are under the power of the Church." Another Jesuit, Schneeman, says: "The love of earthly things which injures the Church's order, obviously cannot be effectually put down by merely spiritual punishments. If that order is to be avenged on what has injured it, if that is to suffer which has enjoyed the sin, temporal and sensible punishments must be employed."

He also adds that the reason why the Church does not punish as of old, is because the State does not protect her in her divine right to burn a man for denying that her head patriarch is greater than God! In one land at least this blessed right of Rome to murder in the name of the Crucified is to-day maintained. In the Concordat made in 1863 with the republics of South America it is laid down in Article 8 that the civil authorities are absolutely bound to execute every penalty decreed by the Spiritual Courts. It is therefore incumbent on such Catholics as Döllinger and Hyacinthe to avoid Quito and Santiago!

Another effect of this dogma will be to erase and obliterate truth as a necessity in history and the affairs of the human race. Its exact office is not merely to control all affairs to the Papal pleasure but to dig out from mankind and consume those immutable principles of justice, right and honor which among heathen as well as Christians have in all ages been thought to rest in the eternal qualities of God. For in the first place if the Pope can decide as God, and since decrees are more easily got from Rome than Heaven, what need of God at all? When the fountain of all virtue is in the Vatican why trouble ourselves about the will of Him who sitteth upon the great white Throne in Heaven? The atheism of this Jesuit dogma we shall expound hereafter. The Pontiff who usurps God's throne is very likely to override God's law. It is from this fountain of evil that in past ages the moral degradation of the Popes themselves proceeded. For they have proved no exception to the rule that a vast irresponsible power in men always corrupts them. For if measurably good Popes like Gregory could say that the Papal tiara was like a crown of thorns to them, a host of worse men have enjoyed their eminency only to manifest a swift degeneracy. So wide-spread has this conviction been in the Latin

Communion, that for ages the advent of otherwise good men to Peter's Chair has been watched by their friends with great anxiety. And yet by a fatal and logical necessity, and unless history for a thousand years be destroyed out of human memory, the Pope must be infallible in order to justify his past domination. For if he be fallible and yet asserts to govern without question, then are his subjects the veriest slaves, since to obey without question a questionable authority, and that too over the souls of men, is the profoundest and bitterest serfdom. But if he be infallible, he is as God, and is as such to be obeyed, and such obedience is the only true liberty.

But abstaining from any further notice of the influence upon the Pope of his own pet dogma, and we touch a more vital matter by inquiring of its logical influence on mankind. And with them, should they accept it, for reasons already noted, it will go very far to destroy all those virtues which have in all time been held to be of supreme value and honor. They must in the first place believe internecine propositions. It must be believed, as in the IXth Century, that Popes decided the same questions exactly opposite, and yet every one was right. It must be believed that when Pope Pelagius declared that the invocation of the Trinity was necessary to valid Baptism and Nicholas I assured the Bulgarians that it was not, both spoke truth. It must be believed that when Stephen II allowed marriage with a slave girl to be annulled, and Baptism valid when administered with wine, while a host of other Popes had condemned both doctrines, none have erred. It must be believed that when Celestine III annulled a marriage where either party became heretical and Innocent III annulled this decision, and Hadrian VI called Celestine a heretic for giving it, that all and several of these decisions were infallible. It must be believed that the decree of Eugenius IV to the Armenians, whereby the Sacraments both of the Western and Oriental Churches as they now hold them were practically mutilated and confused, is the very word of God. It must be believed that when Sixtus VI edited the Latin Bible and ordered it to be received by all under pain of excommunication, though he by actual count had introduced some two thousand errors into it, and Cardinal Bellarmine hushed up the scandal in behalf of his enemy the aforesaid Sixtus, by ancient and unblushing lies, and a member of the Roman Curia, Cardinal Azzolini,

after Bellarmine's death, urged that as he had insulted three Popes and exhibited two as liars, viz., Gregory XIV and Clement VIII, a posthumous work of the great Jesuit should be suppressed and burnt, —everything was done which Christian men should do. Finally that is to be believed which most outrages human reason and affronts the moral convictions of mankind; all that injures the most holy associations with God's Word and denies peace to His people; all miracles, visions and prophecies that Papal fanatics have ever wrought or dreamed; all Papal exegesis, edict and fulmination; the decrees that devastated Alpine valleys and reddened them with the blood of the Albigenses and Vaudois; the holy orders by which the sword smote Protestants in the Netherlands, in Germany, in France and Spain, and that temper of ecclesiastical imperialism which divided the East and West, bred Reformation among Gothic races, and has been for nigh fifteen hundred years an eating cancer at the heart of the Catholic Church.

But perhaps the gravest of all questions involved in this very grave dogma, are the theological ones. And if it should appear that Rome who claims to be the divinely appointed repository of the Faith had corrupted it, so grave a fact will impeach the loyalty of Rome to the Christian Religion in what have always been supposed to be among the most sacred recesses of her power. To men not of the Latin obedience, it has been of late clearly shown by the addition of the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception to the Faith, by the simple act of the Roman pontiff, that the primitive Faith had been boldly corrupted. For as by that dogma the Holy Trinity was changed to a Quaternity, wherein there was one Goddess, the ever Virgin Mary, so now in the new assault on the Creeds by a still more elaborate mixture of sex, even this Quaternity is to be changed to a Quinternity in which his holiness stands a good chance of becoming the First Person in the ever adorable Godhead. But the case is still worse than even this statement makes it. For if, as it will immediately appear, and supposing the Pope be infallible, he can do so much more for us than God, then we have not only no further need of God, but are bound to honor him rather than God. But first, and to dispose of a protest which the Romans are sure to make, it is not logical to say as some do, that his Holiness is only infallible as Pope, and speaking concerning purely spiritual matters, but rather that he

must be infallible in all things, or else in nothing. For besides its sounding most strange to heretical minds, that a Pope in the morning may define any of the inner mysteries of the Godhead, and in the evening be cheated in the shops by some old women with a spurious coin, or at an ample dinner mistake port for sherry, we have the word of a Pope himself to prove that he is infallible in the smallest affairs. We refer to Gregory XVI., who was accustomed to answer all the arguments of his financial minister Capaccini, when he differed from him with the exclamation that as he was Pope he could not err, but must know everything best.

It follows therefore, that if the Pope has this vast power, and chooses to use it, he can do the human race more service than God has willed to do, and is therefore entitled to be the primary object of our worship. For while God has given men but two Revelations, the Pope out of his perennial almightiness may give us any number of them. And as God has used what has seemed a wise reticence about ten thousand mysteries of life and death, so the Pope may reveal them all, since, if it pleases his Infalibility, we may assume to argue that what so benign a potentate can do for us he must and will do. Therefore to go no further, he will constitute himself ecumenical doctor, lawyer, savan for the human race. It follows also that he who so ineffably blesses us should be adored by us. When then on the one side he has absorbed into his own majesty the Divinity, and on the other side become absolute science for humanity, it will only remain for Him to rule as the All—the Universe. He has already destroyed all future Councils, since it is he who decides Faith in person without such cumbersome machinery. He has destroyed one of the three historic orders, in that he has degraded all Bishops to be his satellites, and henceforth he abolishes the Bible, since all the mysteries of Holy Writ are easily solved by his simple word. The heretic is however exposed to one harassing doubt which lies in the question, Suppose Infallibility be an error and yet practiced, what will become of that world ruled by an ancient priest whose volitions are regulated by those gentlemen in black, the Jesuits?

It is not the habit of Churchmen to rail at Rome, and perhaps we are sometimes over charitable, but when she calls a Council not a Council, to determine dogma, we who believe in Councils, beholding the chain riveted for our necks, and running back to Rome,

along which she may transmit a fatal fire to paralyze and wither up all the fair life and flowers of primitive Catholicity; feel it is human nature in us to point back to Popes who poisoned the very sacramental Body and Blood of Jesus Christ on His own altars, to destroy their enemies, and were monsters above the brutes which perish. Rome is old, and the Popes are old, and they have their rights; but Truth also is old, and Justice is old, and they have theirs. Criminals cannot be hid behind Peter's chair. The grand Amphyctionic Council of History condemns without fear the ermined or crowned criminal, and draws the black veil of its contempt over every traitor's face though he were a doge in Venice.

There are those in our own communion who affect Rome, and dream of union with her. But Rome has not changed from Mediæval fashions except for the worse. She remains, as ever, imperial, centralizing, wily, inquisitorial. Those who love truth better than a system cannot touch her; nor those who still cling to the traditions of antiquity, and the Cross of Jesus Christ which she has buried under her novel dogmas. There are indeed set in this age two Romes—the one of the imagination in which she appears as primitive, apostolic, Christlike, immutable and full of peace; and the Rome of Fact, novel, papal, Italian, and full of the red flame that consumes the happiness of the world. Neither of the two are worthy as the case stands of Catholic Communion, but must be resisted by all who love the Church of Christ. We agree then with Janus, when he says:

"We are of the opinion . . . that a great and searching reformation of the Church is necessary, and inevitable, however long it may be evaded,* and with the Spaniard Melchior Carus who was present at Trent, He who thinks Rome can be healed knows little of her; the whole administration of the Church is there converted into a great trading business, a traffic forbidden by all laws, human, natural and divine."

In the Church of St. Maria Maggiore at Trent, is an elaborate inscription announcing that within those sacred walls the Divine Spirit spoke for the last time, "postremum Spiritus Sanctus oracula effudit." In the hour when Papal Infalibility becomes an accomplished fact through the obedience of all Churchmen that inscription ought to be written over the Catholic Church.

* Preface, xv. p.

Art. X.—CHURCH MUSIC AND THE BEAUTIFUL.

We would have placed at the head of this Article the titles of some recent contributions to the musical department of the Church, had we not feared that in naming them we should incur a sort of obligation to exhibit their merits to the best advantage, and, at the same time, preserve an innocent unconsciousness of their shortcomings. This we have no mind to do at present, as we prefer to run over some general ground, not affecting the qualities of particular books, but rather the nature and elementary character of those styles of Church Music, of which all Choir-books assume to be (whether they are or not) the true and regular forms of expression. Occasion will probably arise for the examination of some of our popular Collections of Music. Meanwhile, we bide our time, and keep our counsel in reserve; for the influx of material is, just now, becoming oppressive, and somewhat embarrassing to intelligent and impartial criticism. Of the making of music-books, great and small, good and bad, there seems to be no immediate prospect of a cessation. It is becoming a task of some severity to remember their very titles; while, to retain even the most shadowy idea of their several merits and purposes, is a thing not to be soberly required of human nature. Choir-desks and old-fashioned organ galleries are loaded with these ever multiplying contributions to "the Service of Song," some comprising the labored and finished work of adepts in the divine art, others the untimely offspring of precocity and musical imbecility, and others a kind of conglomerate of gems mixed with clay, in various proportions, to suit all grades of cultivation, and conform to the existing state of the market. Under such a surfeit of Tune-books, Chant-books, Anthem-books, Canticle-books, Hymnals, Noted Psalters, Pointed Psalters, and what not, we long for a breathing-time before we settle down despairingly under the miserable feeling of choral dyspepsia. We trust, however, that things have nearly reached their worst. Overrun as we are with full-grown music-books, and their congeners of less degree, we still have some hope of "a good time coming," when the Church will apply herself as vigorously to restore the purity of her praises, as she once did in removing the accretions which had grown upon her Liturgy and doctrine.

It might very naturally be supposed, by those who are not familiar with the changeable moods of choirs and the regulators of parish music, that the publication and dispersion of so ample a supply of choral works, must necessarily imply, or tend to produce, an elevated and Church-like culture of the musical sentiment, corresponding in fair measure with the tone of those books, and the range of their distribution. But, we apprehend that a collation of facts, gathered from numerous points of observation, will soon destroy our faith in the soundness of this hypothesis. The multitude of books has proved to be, in itself, an obstacle to progress, by occasioning dissipation of thought, and an incessant craving for novelty, rather than the concentration and contented repose of the mind on the material of any one Choir-book—even the best,—and the resolute effort to master and make thorough use of it. At any rate, there are facts enough to show that, for this or some other reason, the voluntary choirs of other days when books were few, were in the common practice of tunes now esteemed too elaborate and difficult when books are many. Of course, we are not now speaking of trained Quartette Choirs, but solely of those which represent the grade of popular taste and ability.

But, underlying all this, there is a much deeper reason why the prevailing standard of Church and Sect Music is so far below the perfection which all, theoretically, allow to be the ultimate measure of its fitness for Divine worship. This reason we will try to state with some clearness, as it will go far to explain that mysterious discrepancy, so observable, between the rapid advance of *secular* music, and the stagnant dullness of much that is denominated *sacred.* When a soil, which, in the natural order of things, should be clothed with living verdure, and throw out spontaneously its rich masses of fragrance, color, and form, is stricken with blight and barrenness, producing only an unsightly and stunted growth of briars, thorns and nettles, we know that some important element of vegetable life has been withdrawn, or become neutralized by the absorption or development of principles noxious to all outgrowth of beauty and luxuriance. Something not unlike this has happened to the Church since the Reformation, in reference to its popular capacity for realizing the true ideal of ritual and other music in the Sanctuary of God. Three hundred years ago, an element was cast into the soil of the Church, destructive not only

of all Catholic action and growth, but also carrying its virulent power within the sphere of Catholic doctrine. It was an element whose peculiarity lay in a daring antagonism to an important truth concerning the Divine nature and essence, and in an open resistance of certain ecclesiastical principles springing directly and necessarily out of that truth. We refer to the attribute or quality of All-perfect *Beauty*, as inherent in the very nature of Him who created the heavens and the earth, and who is the Fountain of all glory and blessing to the Church. Through all ages the Church of God had lived and rejoiced in the conscious belief of this truth; and it was through the agency of Puritanism, in combination with the blindness of popular fanaticism, at and after the period of the Reformation, that such belief was gradually obscured in the Church, and by its absence from the current teaching of the day, became well-nigh crushed out of the public mind. This truth underlies the whole ritual system of the Church, including its music. And its influence extends still further, penetrating even into the region of ecclesiastical architecture; the ornaments of the Church and of its Clergy; and silently working as the ruling element in all things, outward and inward, which have relation to God, and to the patterns of things in heavenly places. The God whom we confess in the Creeds, and adore in the Doxologies of the Church, is not only eternally good and holy, but is also *All-Beautiful.* He is the centre and the exhaustless Fountain of all excellence; and, therefore, from him emanate all the goodness, all the holiness, and all the beauty which we trace in the universe, whether in angels, in men, or in every province of inanimate nature. In God, this element of *beauty* may be conceived to spring out of the perfection of holiness and goodness; and thus the existence of the holy and the good assures us of the presence of the beautiful; because, a being cannot be holy and good without appearing, in those respects, beautiful. The wonderful manifestations of beauty which meet the eye everywhere in the physical world, compel us also to believe, that the *development of the beautiful* is not less the Creator's delight than the exercise of His power and wisdom. Why should the earth be strewed with flowers of every hue, and the heavens glitter as with sparkling gems, and the whole face of nature be adorned with all the elegancies of form and color, so that even a crystal of snow, not less than the gorgeous tints of the cloud and

the rainbow, awaken our admiration, except that God *takes deli* in clothing His works wlth beauty, and would lead us, by t attractiveness and the marvellous diversity of beautiful objects, confess that the hand that made them is Divine?

We refer to the beauty of the natural world, however, only the way of illustration; for our present line of thought confines to the consideration of beauty in its connexion with *moral* a *spiritual* objects. Beauty, then, as the inseparable concomitant holiness and goodness, is an emanation from the throne of G and finds its truest place and home on earth *within the bounds the Catholic Church.* "Out of Zion hath God appeared in *perf beauty.*" "One thing have I desired of the Lord, * * * ev that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my li to behold *the fair beauty* of the Lord, and to visit His temple The Church was formed, and invested with powers more than earth to break up and destroy "the kingdom of sin, Satan, and death which kingdom is the seat and centre of all *deformity;* and restore, and impress upon men, once more, the very image a likeness of God. The Church's charter proclaims her the type earth of all that is good, and holy, and beautiful in that bless land where she will hereafter appear "without spot or blemish And being such a *type*, her office is to represent, and in all ima nable but truthful forms to illustrate before the eye, and impr on the ear and heart of mortal men, "the *beauty of holiness,*" a shines forth in all its glory in the perfection of the *antitype.* A so did the Church, in her better days, when, in the temples of G all things visible and audible awakened the sense of His near P sence; and all the rich adornments, and the joyous bursts of melo and the solemn progress of the Ritual, conspired, as in one gra *Sursum Corda* to raise the thronging crowds above the sin a misery of this troublous world, and carry up their aspirations a their affections into that celestial region, where every type a foreshadowing in the earthly Church shall be realized in the et nal bliss of saints and angels before the throne of God.

But this idea of the alliance of the Beautiful with all sac things was not only foreign to the thoughts of the malconte who sprung up in England during the reigns of Edward VI, Eli beth, and Charles II; but it does not appear to have received just measure of consideration even in the councils of better Chur

men, amid the theological strifes and fearful convulsions incident to the Reformation. The presence of other questions touching the peace, the stability, and the very existence of a pure branch of the Catholic Church in England, together with the rectifying of abuses, the elimination of errors and superfluities from the Liturgy, and the restoration of several points of doctrine to a more primitive and Scriptural form, had the effect of diverting attention, at that time, from subjects not in actual controversy, and thereby leaving such subjects exposed to attack from enemies lying in ambush. It was an error, however, and a fearful misfortune to the Church, as she soon found to her cost. The opportunity of ravaging and defacing her "pleasant things of old" was not likely to be overlooked by a class of discontented men, whose ideas of Reformation were too rash, revolutionary, and profane, to deserve the confidence of the Church. And soon came the issue; for, it is remarkable that from the very first, the Puritanical mind persistently opposed itself to the admission and tolerance of *beauty*, in any department whatever of external religion. To so great an extent was this exclusion carried in the early days of the sect, that it not only stripped the worship of God of all its splendor, but brought its harsh discipline even into the details of private life; so that the very clothing and personal decorations of Christians became objects of suspicion and dislike, unless conformed to that standard of unearthly ugliness which has made the name of the party so memorable. These rabid sectarians, in their zeal for what they called a "*pure* religion," soon brought upon the Church more mischief than three centuries have been able to repair. In the extremity of their blindness, all discrimination was at an end. They mistook the ornaments of the Bride of Christ for the trappings of the "woman of Babylon;" and in their furiousness against "the idolatries of Rome," they defiled the altars, and desecrated the temples of the living God. Under the furiousness of that misshapen and graceless sort of "piety," which "brought axes and hammers into the houses of the Lord," nothing could survive that bore the impress of grace and beauty; and, if the *material* things of the Church—the vessels of gold and silver, the priestly vestments, the rich service-books, the altars, and fonts, and all the instruments and appurtenances of the Sanctuary,—were thought to be polluted with sin, then, it took not long to reach the conclusion that the

Ritual itself was infected and covered with leprosy, and the songs and prayers of the Liturgy shared in the impurity whic spread its taint far and wide. And thus, all the round of l and Even-song, of holy Eucharist and solemn Litany, became the Cross itself, a thing of scandal and offence,—an abomin no longer fit for the ear and the good pleasure of that holy whom the Puritan still blindly adored as his God.

So then, to make "a more complete and godly Reformatio a thorough "purging of the Sanctuary,"—Beauty was dethr and banished, for a time, from her lovely heritage in the Ch as if—like another Eve—she had sinned mortally, and must be expelled from her home in Paradise. And so, Beauty, l poor exile, wandered up and down in the earth, finding favo with the few who remembered the pleasant days of Zion, an bowed the knee in holy worship. And thus time went on—s of grief and sadness to the thoughtful. The Puritan, mean enjoyed his triumph; and his sons lived to see how, as und infused poison, the great mass of public thought, even amon gious men, sunk down gradually into a nerveless apathy, und chill and dreariness which had settled upon Cathedral and I Church alike, years after the times of tribulation and violenc passed over.

And, if the Liturgy, and the consciousness of holy men and there, had not preserved the memory of better things, a life of devotion must have died out in the Anglican Church, a spiritual paralysis.

But it was not to be so. Thoughtful men began, half a ce ago, to realize and distinctly see the mischief which had been to the Church and her Ritual, by those who were not her true but the promoters of doctrines, opinions, usages, and forms o ship wholly alien from her loving spirit and venerable princ Then came the reaction, such as many now living can trace rise; and it came with a power which is still growing and b ing not only mighty, but imperative and majestic, as if act by the energy of the Spirit of God. First of all, the f shades of terror which Calvinism had contrived to raise up l the face of our Heavenly Father, began to disperse and pass Then, the sweet image of holiness rose into view, with no disfi face or gloomy frown to repel and scare away the love of chi

hearts. Then, the true idea of the Church of Christ, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, loomed up like the return of a glorious vision; and in this vision were seen her ancient faith, her sacred worship, her anointed priesthood, her lofty devotion, her Divine charter, her foundation upon the Rock of Ages, and the pledge of her Lord and King, that against her even the gates of hell should never prevail. No wonder that Beauty now returned to her home, and found a joyous welcome, wherever this revival of Church-life had penetrated, and wherever the Offices of Divine worship had been restored to a measure of their native form and proportion. Our forefathers, during the period of the Church's enthralment, had hoped for this, but died without the sight. It is our privilege, however, both to see, and to take part in, this wide-spreading and inspiring effort to render the Service of God more worthy of its great object; and to win from the hearts and voices of men that rich sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, combined with fervent prayer and earnest adoration, which once made the house of God the habitation of supremest *beauty* and the "joy of the whole earth."

Our present subject forbids enlargement on the manifold forms under which this Church-life has been excited, and may be nurtured into further activity, as we proposed to touch on one only of the features of Divine Service, viz., Music. The course of remark, however, in which we have thus far indulged, has seemed necessary, in order to show how it was that, by the violent banishment of the beautiful from the Sanctuary of God, the music of the Ritual sunk, by degrees, into the depressed condition from which so large a body of earnest men are now seeking to recover it. And we must bear in mind, also, that the Church in the United States, at the period of its organization, could boast of no higher standard of music than that which existed in the parish churches of England. The musical poverty which oppressed *them*, was sensibly felt by the daughter Church in America; and many years passed away before sufficient advancement was made to revive even the simple practice of *chanting*. The observations, therefore, which have been made, though referring primarily to the Church of England, will, for evident reasons, be equally applicable to the Church in the United States.

The efforts which the Church is now very generally making for the restoration of music to a state of excellence, which shall secure

not only legitimacy of style, but also beauty of form and expression, are such as can only be understood by referring, first of all, to the ground and material on which all her action must be necessarily based. Church music, unlike Church doctrine, has no positive form or model set forth by Divine or Apostolic authority, and commanding for itself universal and perpetual recognition in the temples of God. The Christian Scriptures do not furnish any rule for our guidance in celebrating by vocal songs the praises of the Almighty; and as the New Testament is thus silent on the subject, music is left altogether in the hands of the Church, as a matter of discipline to be regulated by her own wisdom and discretion. Music is both an art and a science; and, like all other arts and sciences, the inspired writers leave it free, gradually to improve and expand into perfection, as language, architecture, painting, and sculpture had done before it. And it is no mean proof of the supreme wisdom of God, and of His boundless foresight, that, while the doctrines and facts of the Christian *Faith* are unchangeably *settled* and *determined*, there is no inspired interdict on the growth of human knowledge, on the development of the sciences, and the progress of the arts;—the only presumption seeming to be (from the nature of the case), that whenever these, or any of them, are employed for sacred purposes, in whatever age of the world it may be, the *best* exhibitions which that age can produce ought to be allotted and consecrated to an object so pre-eminent above all other claims.

As the Scriptures, therefore, have not indicated or prescribed any particular style of music to be used everywhere, and at all times, in alliance with the Catholic Faith, as the vehicle of the Church's offering of praise, we have next to inquire, what the rulers of the Church have done for the regulation of this important part of Divine worship. If we look to the practice of the Church in the present day for a satisfactory answer to this question, we shall probably have some difficulty in finding it, as our present discipline has thrown upon Presbyters the burden of musical responsibility and the Presbyters have not, as yet, found the way clear for the turning away of the hearts of the people from choral declension and vanities, and winning their affections for a loftier range of ideas in uttering God's most worthy praise. For, though we cling with some tenacity to the ancient Creeds, yet we have no

adhered with similar strictness to the ancient, or even the Reformed, prescription for the due rendering of the Anglican Liturgy. Our current mode of offering the Liturgy (we use the word here in its popular sense), is, for the most part peculiar to ourselves. We are accustomed to *read* what our forefathers *chanted* or uttered in a monotone—*i. e.*, we read or say unmusically, what they read or said musically. Our chanting, also, whether Anglican or otherwise, is a deviation,—and, we think, a justifiable and happy one,—from original forms; and, in a scientific and æsthetic point of view, such chanting will be found to embrace elements, which,—in the nature of things—must be wanting in the productions of an age when musical refinement and beauty, as *now* understood, were almost unknown. It is true that we use occasionally short chants which we call *Gregorian;* and, in a measure, they are such, but so greatly modified and modernized (as we shall show presently), that their distinctive character is almost lost. Such a thing, indeed, as a full Gregorian Service embracing all parts of the Liturgy and Ritual has not yet been heard among us; unless we consider the Choral Service in that light, deducting from it the ornamental array in which alone it now appears. This will show that our style of music in Divine worship has changed, and is gradually acquiring more of the element of beauty, under the influence of modern habits of thought and the progress of musical science and refinement within the last three or four centuries.

To chanting, we have also added metrical Psalms and Hymns, with tunes corresponding; Anthems, Services, Motetts, Kyries, Sentences, Polyphonal Canticles, and various Doxologies. All these we now have in forms of great variety, from the plain to the florid, from the most simple in construction to the rich and ornate, from the plaintive expression of penitence to the joyous shout of spiritual triumph.

In regard to the age and history of metrical Psalm and Hymn tunes, as we now have them, a remark or two may not be out of place. It is more than probable that this highly rhythmical style of sacred music was, in great measure, the offspring of the Reformation on the continent of Europe. Long before that event, hymns and sacred songs, Christmas carols, and religious ballads, had been in common use, and were doubtless sung to melodies adapted to poetical measure. It has also been proved that, in very

many cases, the later melodies to metre Psalms, were formed from strains or musical phrases broken off, as it were, from the chants which had long been in use in public worship. The continental Reformers and their followers, as is well known, had a remarkable passion for what we now call "Psalmody;" and this manifested itself in translations of the Psalms of David into metrical verse; the consequence of which was, that a sufficient abundance of short and very grave melodies, tunes, or chorals, came into being soon after, adapted to these versions of the Psalms. Some of the Reformers, themselves, found leisure, and possessed ability, to express their thoughts in musical notes, particularly Martin Luther, to whom we are said to be indebted for the melody of that fine composition, the "Judgment Hymn," together with a few well-known and admirable chorals. In England, also, metrical versions of the Psalms, Creeds and sundry Prayers, with accompanying music, came into being as early as about the middle of the sixteenth century. "In or about the year 1560, 'The whole Psalter, translated into English metre,' by Doctor (afterwards Archbishop) Parker, was printed at London by John Daye.'" To this work, that renowned musician, Thomas Tallis, contributed eight "tunes," in *rhythm* corresponding to that of the words, but in *form* differing from the brief Choral or continental Psalm tune, by extending over several verses. From No. 8 of these tunes, our present popular tune to Bishop Ken's Evening Hymn has been derived. It was at the same period that the metrical Psalms of Sternhold and Hopkins appeared, furnishing an additional reason for the production of tunes embracing only a single verse.

The Psalm-tune having thus made its appearance about the time of the Reformation, has maintained a certain kind of popularity for a period of about three hundred years. It came into use by a sort of necessity; for, men on the continent, and the English Puritans after them, *would* have metre Psalms; and if metre Psalms were to be sung, it is clear that there must be tunes to sing them to. Accordingly, in the early editions of these poetical versions of the Psalms, the music was printed on the same page with the words, as may be seen by referring to the old Psalm-books in our libraries. It is surprising however, that some of these reforming people did not foresee what havoc the poets would be likely to make of the beauty and devotional sweetness of the Psalms of

David, if allowed to torture and amplify them for the sake of rhyme, and to gratify the questionable taste then prevailing. Nothing could have been easier than to *chant* the Psalms just as they stood in the Bible or Prayer Book, and thus have secured them from damage, perversion, and abuse. But, at that point, Puritan prejudice came into play; and, as everybody knew that chanting was one of the old customs of the Romish Church, this was accounted a sufficient reason why it ought not to be tolerated. To make the matter worse, chanting had still been retained in the Church of England, under "the prelacy;" and, as the Puritans were bent upon having a new Church, and a new worship to suit themselves, they could not consent to the retaining of anything which might possibly issue in mischief. Lest, then, they should even *seem* to favor Popery and "prelacy," they would not chant David's Psalms at all, as they stood in the Prayer Book; but, these holy Psalms must first be made to assume a new form under the hand of some industrious versifier; and then, with the help of music well matched with the rhyme, these disfigured songs of Sion were accepted, and adopted into the public worship of God.

Since that time, another and more free and florid style of metre tune has come into use, which may for convenience sake be called the *Hymn-tune*, though now often used with metre Psalms. This seems to have been suggested by the numerous Metre Hymns, on every variety of sacred subject, which have been written, collected, and to some considerable extent introduced into the services of the Lord's house since the period of the Reformation. The Hymn-tune admits of greater scope and flexibility in the melody, and more richness in the harmony, than the stiff and methodical old Psalm-tune. It was carried to, perhaps, its highest pitch of display, and even complexity of construction, about the close of the last century and the beginning of the present. We have seen, and have now in our possession, Hymn-tunes composed, and publicly used about that period in sectarian places of worship, which, for elaborateness of construction and difficulty of execution, far exceed the tunes found in our present books, or heard in the greater number of our Churches. Tunes of this character were exceedingly popular among the English Dissenters, especially the "Independents" and the Methodists. Mr. Wesley himself, being a man of fine musical sensibility, does not appear to have had any

very strong predilection for the heavy and powerfully somniferous tunes which, long before his day, had been admitted even into the Church of England, and found a place among parish choirs. He had, evidently, a better notion of Church-music than that of a low lengthened wailing of minims and semibreves. He had no idea that men should show their Christian joy by groaning dismally through a triumphant Psalm or Hymn,—forcing its poetry on the rack, and tearing syllable from syllable with imperturbable coolness. And therefore he did wisely in publishing (it is said) or sanctioning a collection of tunes of a higher order,—tunes of sterling merit as musical compositions, and in a style so rich and expressive that most of his followers, at the present day, would despair of attempting them; though it is very certain that Mr. Wesley intended them for the use, *not* of a first-rate *choir*, but of a whole congregation.

We have thus referred, somewhat briefly, to these several styles of modern Church-music, and only add that so far as the element of beauty is concerned, the Hymn-tune opened a large field for its nurture,—a field already rich with compositions from the pens of the most cultivated writers.

But amid all this influx of modern ideas, the Church still acknowledges the *chant*, in some form, as the basis of all,—as the most ancient, prominent, and effective agency which music can supply for the devout rendering of the Psalms and the larger portion of her Offices of worship. The chant seems to be the Church's own special property, inherited from ages past, and by her to be reverently used, and then transmitted to the future. Psalm and Hymn-tunes, chorals, and such like, are far more modern, as we have seen, and (though valuable in their place) they do not seem to grow out quite as naturally from the Church's system, but rather to share her life as grafts inserted into a well-rooted tree.

It would seem natural that, in very early times, when music was in its infancy, if men felt disposed to add its voice to the expression of their words, they would employ but a few commonplace tones or sounds, and adapt these to their words with great simplicity, not at all resembling the artificial manner in which we, in an age of high musical culture, should proceed in doing the same thing. This, then, in point of fact, would constitute the strict chant, in its plain, elementary, and unadorned shape. And it is

evident that a wide field of inquiry is here thrown open, in which we might attempt to trace the pedigree and the distant birthtime of this primitive music.

The Jews, it may be affirmed, were, for their times, as far advanced in music as any other people in the world. Even anterior to their settlement in the holy land, who can doubt that the plaintive dirge went up from this oppressed people, in the land of Pharaoh, and in the hearing of the task-masters of Egypt? And the sacred writer, after telling of their miraculous deliverance from the house of bondage, proceeds to inform us with marvellous particularity, how the "timbrels and dances" were suddenly called forth on the Eastern shore of the Red Sea,—and how there sprung from the rescued people the prolonged and victorious shout, "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever! Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath he cast into the sea; his chosen captains also are drowned in the Red Sea." But, if "Moses and the children of Israel" united in this magnificent strain,—as we are told,—it is impossible that they could have done so except in music of the very simplest form. Harmony or counterpoint, they did not possess,—this being an outgrowth of science belonging to a far later period. It follows, therefore, that *melody*, (or in popular phrase, "a single part,") was all the vocal music of their day. And, if we further appeal to Jewish history and tradition for the original of music among the ancient people of God, we shall be referred at once to that heirloom of their nation, the Hebrew chant—a thoroughly primitive thing, rough enough to *our* ears, but still venerable with all manner of holy associations, sacred as Horeb, and even at this day, vibrating as it were to the timbrel of Miriam. It is, then, something more than a conjecture, that the song of Moses was given in the simple, nervous, and appropriate form of a chant. If reason can prove anything, they shouted their triumphs in such a tune as put the plainest adorning on the words,—such a tune as the wearied Jew might make, a bold, hearty, and unpolished strain, just such as befitted the time and the occasion.

But, after all, this was only the rough draught of what we now call chanting,—a kind of type or foreshadowing of something better to come. It was music, indeed,—loud, cheering, emphatic, arousing music,—such as we might imagine a multitude giving forth, amid the din of timbrels and rams' horns, and with the fur-

ther accompaniment of piercing trumpets and roaring sackbuts. How long it was before this primitive kind of chant threw off its original roughness,—what amount of improvement it received during the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness,—whether the Hebrew "plain song" was handed down faithfully to Deborah and Barak by a sort of uninterrupted succession,—and in what shape king David found the musical records of the nation, are questions about which we might weary ourselves in speculation, without reaching any positive result. This much we may learn from the Bible, that several years before the erection of the temple, a full and effective choral establishment was instituted by king David. To say nothing of the players on instruments, there was a large body regularly appointed, whose office, we are told, was "for *song*" or vocal music, "in the house of the Lord." Of these singers there were twenty-four distinct divisions or choirs of twelve persons each. "So the number of them with their brethren," says the record, "that were instructed in the songs of the Lord, was two hundred, four-score, and eight." There were also what we should call "music-schools," with classes under training; from all which we may argue that Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, under the royal sanction, applied themselves industriously to the perfecting of the Choral Service of the sanctuary, and to the formation of much of the exterior "beauty of holiness."

Of the minuter details of such a Service we have no accurate record. We can only gather from general statements that it was such as befitted the temple of the Lord of hosts,—a temple whose services were ordained of heaven—whose songs were given by Divine inspiration, and whose praises were, for the times, so august and affecting as to well deserve the appellation of "beautiful," which the sacred writers so often apply to them. And let us not forget that those very same Psalms which the tribes went up to sing in grand Choral Service, are *now*, and ever will be, the burden of the Church's joy, more precious to her than rubies and gold. The Book of Psalms is evidence of what the Jew was called to engage in; when he approached the services of God's holy temple. It is, in fact, a book of sacred lyrics, composed in many of its parts with a direct adaptation to choral use; and, as frequently, with directions—understood at the time—relative to the manner of performance. Here we recognize, without a shade of doubt, the

ancient *responsive* style carried on by two alternate choirs, or divisions of the congregation. If then, in the book of Psalms this alternate style is evident in numerous places, sometimes even in its strongest and most decisive form, this is conclusive proof of the point that the words were *chanted*,—not, indeed, in the measured and rhythmical style which the modern chant has assumed, but in the manner which prevailed thousands of years ago, in the strict Israelitish fashion, voices and instruments being probably arranged in two bodies composed partly of each, and thus giving full effect and meaning to the Psalmist's conceptions.

Again, as these chants of the temple were evidently not intricate and labored compositions, but plain, simple, and yet expressive strains in their way, so they formed a kind of music, which easily caught the ear, and took firm hold of the public memory. It appears that they were preserved with a characteristic fondness during the entire period of the captivity,—preserved, at least, in their general style and features. This we might easily infer from the unrivalled nationality of the Jew, ever spurring him on to a loving and conservative adherence to the customs of his ancestors. But we have on this point, something more than presumptive evidence, for, on the return from the captivity, when preparations were making for the rebuilding of the temple, the Levites with cymbals, and the priests with their trumpets, again praised the Lord, as we are told, "after *the ordinance of David*, king of Israel." Nor was this all, for the responsive style itself appears again after a long exile;—"and they sung together *by course*, in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord." Furthermore, immediately on the renewal of the temple service, the Choral body was reorganized on the model of the olden time, by singers whose order, office and skill had been faithfully preserved in Babylon, whatever aching of heart and spasms of affliction they had encountered by the Euphrates in trying to "sing the Lord's song in a strange land."

In passing from the Jewish to the Christian Church, we do not find that the style of music which had so long prevailed, was laid aside as a Jewish peculiarity, or as a mere appendage of the ceremonial law. Indeed, we have already traced it from a period antecedent to the regular organization of the Jewish Church and nation, though it became afterwards so thoroughly interwoven with the established Ritual. Besides, as the Psalms of David were not

superseded by the New Testament, though they formed a part of the temple service, we know no reason why the ancient *style* in which they were sung should not accompany their adoption into the Christian Church. We say *style*, and nothing more; for we imagine that very few even of our severest Ritualists would object to the exclusion of the unpolished and imperfect Hebrew chant. For this we are not pleading, but for something purer and more beautiful,—for the art or style itself, in a more advanced condition, with all its worth, and all the facilities it affords for singing and making melody to the Lord. This, the Christian Church has claimed for long ages, and for the best of reasons. The theory, once inherited from the older dispensation, was, in Apostolic times, carried into the Church of Christ, where it found a nobler realm and sphere of improvement. It grew with the Church, having taken deep root in the primitive age; and, identifying itself with the original Liturgies, was carried to all the corners of the earth by the messengers of peace, accompanying and everywhere heralding the victories of the Church, and the glorious news of man's redemption.

How far chanting retained this eminence in after ages, and by what successive steps our present Choral Service was formed, and how the modern Anglican chant came in with its present systematic and regular form, would be interesting topics of inquiry here, if want of space did not compel us to pass over much that might be said. The introduction of organs, and of systems of harmony, and the improved plan of musical notation, must have given new scope to the fancy of the composer, and greatly facilitated the labors of those who sought to make the praise of God "glorious." Much, in regard to the Ritual, was done in what some call "the dark ages." Genius and taste flourished then, in certain directions, most luxuriantly, sombre and disturbed as were, at times, the political and social aspect of things outside of the Church. If the natural sciences and the wonders of mechanism had not then begun to throw open new fields of thought and enterprise, yet, painting and poetry, were redeeming graces of the times, not less than the aspiring and unearthly glories of Gothic architecture,—all which have left their striking memorials and proofs, for the special astonishment of those who think that all the earth was in darkness till the sun rose on the nineteenth century.

Music, however, *did* proceed more tardily than architecture; ›ut it was some compensation for this, that every forward step it nade was both safe and important. The early masters in the ifteenth and sixteenth centuries, if judged by their works, must ıave been a singularly industrious and persevering class of men. They wrought out their Fugues and Canons, Motetts, and other nusic for the Church, with wonderful art, considering that, at first hey had to find out the laws of musical science by analyzing and arefully scrutinizing their own compositions. Nor can we blame hose quaint old masters for their industrious circumvolutions, vhen, as yet, the forms of counterpoint and even the outlines of ›eauty were so imperfectly marked out. They did their best, and ve owe them reverence as well as gratitude for their labors. Meanvhile, the Chant, in close contact with the Church's ritual, was aking advantage of all the discoveries and improvements of the lay. With the flowing in of a more refined sense of the beautiul, bringing things to a position where ability might expatiate vith more ample range, the Cathedral musicians applied themselves o the formation and the perfecting of a new style of chant, in vhich the finer points of musical form and harmonious combination night have full play. The severe and solemn monotony of the nelodies which came into being when the art was in its rudimenary condition, now gave way to a free and discursive application of the higher powers of invention. The scope of the Anglican hant, it is true, lies within boundaries more contracted than those of the Anthem, or even the better class of Hymn-tunes; but still, within those narrow limits there was found range enough for the talents of men who had the power of inspiration and the stimulus of devout and Churchly emotion. The beauty and impressiveness of many of these short Anglican Chants is really surprising. They prove that much may be done in a little space, if we only have wit enough to know how to do it. The masters of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have not disdained to embody in the Anglican form of the chant, some of their finest conceptions,—conceptions which prove better than any theory, the true capabilities of this beautiful style.

Much, however, has lately been said and written, both in England and America, in depreciation of the Anglican chant, by those who seem to consider Catholicity as obstructive rather than pro-

gressive in relation to the musical feature of Divine worship, and who, therefore, contend that the chants commonly known as *Gregorian*, being more ancient, simple, and practicable than the Anglican, are entitled to a place of precedence corresponding with this judgment of their merits. We have already thrown out a hint touching this diversity between the two styles of chants; and, as we honestly think that this diversity is more generally *felt* than understood in the Church, we may as well conclude our article with some remarks concerning these Gregorian chants, to balance what we have written respecting the Anglican.

The chants bearing the name of 'Gregorian" in our books, are derived from the eight Ecclesiastical Tones, with their several endings, as revised by St. Gregory in the seventh century. These tones were used by the Anglican Church for many ages before the Reformation, in chanting the Latin Psalms. We ourselves use them chiefly in two forms; 1st, as re-written and thrown into the regular and rhythmical shape of our ordinary simple chants, in which case, they lose (for the most part) their Gregorian characteristics, and become neither more nor less than Anglican chants. 2d, we use them in their original form, which is much less regular, and follows the accentuation and emphasis of the words, without regard to musical rhythm. In both cases, it is the *melody* alone to which we refer as Gregorian, and this is intended to be sung by all the voices in unison. From this it follows that, to obtain a true idea of a chant popularly known as "Gregorian," we must use the air or melody, and that *alone*, without any accompaniment on the organ, except in unison or octaves. For, in so far as we embellish that naked melody, it ceases to be pure "Gregorian," and falls into the category of modern music, good or bad, as the case may be. As, however, this reduction of the chant to its real "Gregorian" character, by stripping it of its borrowed raiment, is very seldom done, it is easy to understand that many persons are pleased with the *disguise*, simply because they never take the trouble to see the *skeleton*. In our times, as we have just said, these chants or Tones have been clothed in *harmony*, thereby altering their characteristic features so completely, that it may well be questioned whether St. Gregory himself, if present, would easily recognize his own share in the complex performance. This harmony, it should be well understood, is entirely a modern addi-

n, though our musicians have sought to give it an antique col-
ng, by imitating the rough and inelegant combinations and pro-
ssions which were common among composers several centuries
. It seems to be imagined by some of these harmonizers of the
ed Gregorians, that ugliness is the mother of solemnity, and
t a tortured ear is one of the best things in the world for stir-
g up the religious feelings and making one a good Catholic. A
egorian chant, under such treatment, is not, after all, invested
th any such dress as would carry the thoughts back very far into
e remoteness of Catholic antiquity; for there is no such thing in
xistence as really ancient harmony,—harmony, for instance, of the
imes of St. Gregory, or his successors for several centuries after.
The science of harmony is a thing of comparatively modern growth,
e., it has been formed and perfected within about the last three
r four hundred years. The ancients, even the most refined, could
ot, in the nature of things, have understood more than the sim-
le rudiments of that theory of harmonious combinations, which
rms the basis of all regular musical compositions, and is now re-
ived in every enlightened nation of the world. In the fragments
music which have come down to us from antiquity, specimens of
hich are given in the works of Dr. Burney, and Sir John Hawk-
s, we find nothing but the very rudest attempts at the forma-
on even of *melody;* while, in the province of *harmony*, there
only enough to show that the writers had no conception of either
e beauty or the vastness of its meaning.

And there were several reasons for this, at which we will barely
lance, for the sake of the musical portion of our readers. The
rst was, that the diatonic and chromatic scales, on which all reg-
lar music is founded, were not then understood, except in the way
f a mathematical computation of intervals; and consequently, what
e now require as a good melody could not be made but by chance.
econd; the old imperfect scales on which music was written, were
with one exception) so unfitted for regular harmony, that some
genuity is even now required for their treatment. And third;
he instruments then in use were not those which have served so
nportant a purpose within the last three hundred years, in bring-
g to perfection the science of musical combinations. The an-
ients, of course, had no Piano Fortes; they had no Organs, ex-
ept of the most imperfect construction; they had not even the

old-fashioned Harpsichord, the Spinet, or the Virginal. They h[illegible]d nothing resembling our keyed flutes, or keyed horns and trumpe[illegible]s; much less had they that variety of fine and rich-toned instrume[illegible]ts which belong to the modern Orchestra. When we read, therefo[illegible]e, about the wonderful effects of music in ancient times, we must [illegible]e-member that the public ear had not been educated above its lev[illegible]el, and was easily excited and satisfied,—a thing not hard to be cre[illegible]d-ited, seeing that Orpheus found in the trees, rocks, and mountai[illegible]ns of those happy times, an audience not disposed to be critic[illegible]l. Reverting, then, to the fragments of Greek music which ha[illegible]ve been preserved, (and the Gregorian Tones rest entirely on a Gre[illegible]ek foundation), we find nothing, as already hinted, which indicat[illegible]es advancement beyond the lowest elements of the art,—nothi[illegible]ng which shows even a glimmering of genius, or the least trace of el[illegible]e-gance, design, or scientific ability,—nothing, in short, but a seri[illegible]es of bald, meaningless sounds, such as no modern ear could endur[illegible]e, except as a punishment. So far as musical science, harmony, an[illegible]nd beauty are concerned, antiquity—even Catholic antiquity—is to [illegible]us little more than a blank. The student derives no practical a[illegible]d-vantage from it; the composer gains not a single model; and th[illegible]he theory of harmony now universally received, takes rank as alto[illegible]to-gether the formation of a much later age.

From all this we gather little to uphold the rather extravagan[illegible]nt laudations sometimes bestowed on our present versions of *Gregor[illegible]or-ian* music, as variously exhibited in chant, Te Deum, Creed, Gloria [illegible]ria in excelsis, Canticle, or in adaptations to Metre Hymns. For[illegible]r, under the weight of the pseudo-antique harmony assigned them in[illegible] in some of our books, such praise must needs have an unsuspecte[illegible]ed origin and termination *in the mere glory of Gregory's name;* while [illegible]le the same melodies, if subjected to a more graceful style of embel-[illegible]l-lishment, lose their essential quality as Gregorian, and the moder[illegible]n ornamentation becomes mainly the object of admiration. In say-[illegible]y-ing this, we only desire that things should be called by their righ[illegible]t names, and that Church people should know precisely what i[illegible]s Gregorian, and what is *not*, thereby qualifying themselves to do[illegible] justice to the organist, without overlooking what is really due to[illegible] the saint.

We are glad to find, however, that though in the earlier days of the great Church movement in England and America, it was

ought that the revival of plain-song and the grand Festal devel-
ments of a Catholic Ritual were, in some sort, identified with the
ouch and astringent harmonies of a former age, and with the
de forms of mediæval melodies, yet this tendency to scientific
d æsthetic retrogression in reference to Church music has
een moderated, if not abandoned, through a consciousness of the
hurch's power and right to assimilate whatever is valuable in the
iscoveries of human wisdom, and to employ in every age all that
prings up in the line of research, as a new element of force and
oly influence in the kingdom of God. Under the first impressions
ttending the revival of Catholic life, doctrine, and Ritual, it would
ppear that the simplicity of plain-song, and the rigid severity of
he old ecclesiastical melodies, were very generally considered as
urnishing a standard to which all the music of the Church should
ear a certain resemblance. Hence, among other results, we ob-
erve the reduction even of Metre Hymn-tunes to a degree of plain-
ess, uniformity, and mechanical tramp-like movement, which is
ery often in direct antagonism with the splendor and seraphic
eauty of the poetry associated with them. We could point to in-
ances of Festival hymns, in certain collections, where the music is
terly inexpressive of the sentiment, and hangs as a dead weight on
efforts of the poet. Of course, in such cases, and under such
ditions, the cultivation of the beautiful in alliance with the
red, was almost as hopeless as in the chilly atmosphere of Pur-
ism itself. Second thoughts, wiser thoughts, and thirty years'
rience, have, at least, brought about a perceptible change re-
ting the soundness of a theory which allows unlimited range to
aspirations of poetry, but ties down and cramps its sister
e with bonds belonging to another and a less advanced age.
hurch itself is by nature *progressive*, and is ever striving to
om earth all that is pure, lovely, precious and beautiful, that
y fill every niche in her temple with gifts, hallowed and con-
d to the honor of her Lord and King. True Catholicity
t content with the acquisitions of the past, but appropriates
overies of the present, and anticipates the treasures dimly
the future. But for the spirit of progress, ever coincident
urch life, never would the rustic churches of the early
have given way before the advance of that nobler archi-
which, with mingled strength and beauty, at length cul-

minated in the gorgeous Cathedrals and Abbeys of Europe. This is but one among many illustrations. It may serve to indicate and interpret all we have aimed to express in this article concerning the logical value of Catholic antecedents in moulding the music of the present. To the Choral Service, it is not readily conceivable that the Church can add much, either of solemn grandeur or of placid beauty, except in its performance. But beyond this, in a field partly given up to sourness and sterility, and partly desecrated by the intrusion of secular art and meretricious display, she may find ample room for such a reform, as will purify her courts and win the gratitude of her sons.

BOOK NOTICES.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, FROM THE FALL OF WOLSEY TO THE DEATH OF ELIZABETH. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A. Vols. I and II. New York, CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co.

The brilliant Macaulay conferred a substantial benefit when he traced the influence of the English Revolution, on the English Constitution and the English History. The change of the succession by Parliament was one of the most important legislative acts ever recorded. Its impression has ever since been visible in America, and is traceable to-day in the condition of France, and Italy, and Spain. Here was a greater concession to the people than Magna Charta itself, and a precursor of all the marvellous revolutions which are sweeping over Europe. Yet, after all, the great modern battle for human rights was fought nearly two centuries before the House of Orange was voted to the throne, and was valiantly won by a Prince who was an essential tyrant. England is the mother of Freedom. In her constitution and her laws, and her development, we see the noblest union between Conservatism and Progress, and in no pages of her history can be read deeper lessons of wisdom than those which record the reigns of Henry and Elizabeth. Whatever the mistakes of Froude, he has the merit of catching and fixing the genius of the era he describes in bold and graphic language. His style, if sometimes labored, is always interesting and often brilliant. He has severely studied original documents, and seems honestly to intend fidelity. We regret that he is not more in sympathy with the venerable Church of England, and sometimes even suspect his regard for Christianity. He is certainly not completely Orthodox in his Faith, and yet the sprightliness, the originality, the learning, the power of his history have, perhaps, made it, for all future time, a part of the Literature of England. No where is so vividly, so truthfully, so impressively described the mighty contest maintained by Papal usurpation and Roman error, with

the free spirit of England incarnated in her eighth Henry, and triumphant in her imperious Elizabeth. The struggle beginning with the divorce of the father, was carried forward through scenes of intrigue and of blood, which convulsed Europe, until it was virtually ended in the reign of the daughter by that tempest which buried in the ocean the superiority of Spain and the Papacy.

Froude is usually rather bold than tender, and yet in his delineation of the Charter-house Monks he has given us a touching picture, which melts into tearful sympathies as we contemplate the mingled simplicity and dignity of men, who, if the victims of superstitions, yet exhibited the courage of martyrs.

"Then all who were present," says Channey, "burst into tears, and cried with one voice, 'Let us die together in our integrity, and heaven and earth shall witness how unjustly we are cut off.'" "The prior answered sadly,—'Would, indeed that it might be so—but they will not do us so great a kindness, nor to themselves so great an injury. Many of you are of noble blood, and what I think they will do is this. Me and the elder brethren they will kill, and they will dismiss you that are young into a world which is not for you. If, therefore, it depend on me alone—if my oath will suffice for the house—I will throw myself for your sakes on the mercy of God. I then will make myself anathema; and to preserve you from these dangers, I will consent to the King's will. If, however, they have determined otherwise—if they choose to have the consent of us all—the will of God be done. If one death will not avail, we will die all.' The day after he preached a sermon, and then rising from his place, he went direct to the eldest of the brethren, who was sitting nearest to himself, and kneeling before him, begged his forgiveness for any offence, which in heart, word, or deed, he might have committed against him. Thence, he proceeded to the next, and said the same; and so, to the next, through us all, we following him, and saying as he did, each from each, imploring pardon. The third day after was the mass of the Holy Ghost, and God made known His presence among us. For when the host was lifted up, there came, as it were a whisper of air, which breathed upon our faces as we knelt. Some perceived it with the bodily senses; all felt it as it thrilled into their hearts, and then followed a sweet, soft sound of music, at which our venerable father was so moved, God being thus abundantly manifested among us, that he sank down into tears, and for a long time could not continue the service—we all remaining stupefied, hearing the melody, and feeling the marvellous effect of it upon our spirits, but knowing neither whence it came, nor whither it went, only our hearts rejoiced as we perceived that God was with us indeed."

These monks were heroes. Their lives shine through that period of superstitious gloom encircled with a mild glory. Never has the spirit of martyrdom invested men with a more subdued majesty.

THE HOLY GRAIL, AND OTHER POEMS.—By ALFRED TENNYSON, D. C. L., Poet Laureate. Boston, Fields, Osgood & Co. Cincinnati, Robert Clarke, 1870.

Where is the charm of Tennyson? He does not certainly possess the inspiration of the highest genius. He is not distinguished for originality in plot, or description, or character. He has slight dramatic power. He is seldom intense, and never sublime. Yet few poets have created a wider circle of influence, and so extensive a reputation must be supported by some solid merit. Tennyson's success does not arise from the fact that he aspires to the loftiest attainments of his art, but that he reaches the height which he has proposed.

His promise is never larger than his performance. If he does not stand on the most elevated summit, he yet never fails to occupy a respectable, and even commanding position. His verse is always correct. His rhythm is frequently exquisite. His imagery is usually pleasing, invariably chaste, and often striking. While you do not rise from the perusal of his Poems with any remarkable elevation of soul, you can never leave them with a painful disappointment. Besides, Tennyson is characterized by a most stainless purity. His spirit has never been sullied by the coarseness of the age. It must also be remembered that some of his songs are as exquisite in their music and their sentiment as any our English Literature can boast, and we are glad to find that a writer so usually solemn has also exhibited a keen sense of the ludicrous in his "Northern Farmer."

The following we regard as one of the most striking descriptions in the present volume, and yet by no means equalling what Tennyson has elsewhere produced.

> "And Galahad fled along them hedge by hedge,
> And every hedge as quickly as he crost
> Sprang into fire and vanished, tho' I yearn'd
> To follow, and thrice above him all the heavens
> Open'd, and blared with thunder such as seem'd
> Shoutings of all the Sons of God, and first
> At once I saw him far in the great sea
> In silver-shining armor starry clear,
> And o'er his head the holy vessel hung
> Clothed in white samite, or a luminous cloud.
> —I saw the spiritual city and all her spires
> And gateways in a glory like one pearl
> —No larger, though the goal of all the saints—
> Strike from the sea, and from the star there shot
> A rose-red sparkle on the city, and there
> Dwelt, and I knew it was the Holy Grail."

Perhaps this is equal, or even superior.

> "The great hand
> Made lightnings in the splendor of the moon,
> And flashing round and round, and whirl'd in an arch
> Shot like a streamer of the Northern Sea
> Seen where the moving isles of winter shook
> By night, with noises of the Northern Sea,
> So flashed and fell the brand Excalibur,
> But ere he dipt the surface rose an arm
> Clothed in white samite, mystic, wonderful,
> And caught him by the belt, and brandish'd him
> Three times, and drew him under in the mere."

THE ODES AND EPODES OF HORACE. A metrical translation into English with Introduction, and Commentaries. By LORD LYTTON, with Latin text from the editions of Orelli, Mac Leane & Yonge. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1870.

Horace is remarkable for the completeness rather than the greatness of his genius. He was certainly deficient in depth of feeling, in enthusiasm of char-

acter, in largeness of purpose, and those sympathies, aspirations, and impulses which most elevate and refine a human soul. Nothing is more lamentable than the absence of such elements. Besides, Horace, is often repulsively vulgar and licentious. He impresses you as a polished but hollow man of the world, overflowing indeed with a certain genial kindness, and joyousness of temperament rather than of heart, which makes him resemble a bright stream reflecting all passing images of beauty from its surface, while nature in its deeper waters finds no place. And it is from this very circumstance he derives his popularity. More persons admire the sparkles of the river than its breadth, and power, and majesty. Horace had a quick perception, a vivacious fancy, a perfect taste, a cultivated mind, and a musical ear. He caught at a glance both the weak and the wicked in human character. He was sensitively alive to the more obvious beauties of nature. He found in the Augustan age countless subjects both of ridicule and satire. He thoroughly understood his own genius, and never seriously attempted to awake the deeper feelings of the heart. His aim even in his own satires was rather to amuse than to reform, and his "Ars Poetica," so inimitable and instructive, scarcely relieves the impression produced by his other works, that the writer is a gay, but unequalled trifler. Yet in the sphere to which he was impelled by his genius, and his age, Horace has no rival in ancient or modern literature. What simplicity! What vivacity! What originality! How sweet his rhythm! How varied his verse! How amusing his ridicule! How sharp his satire! How sparkling his wit! As specimens of Art his Odes are perfect! Yet they never kindle you like the fire of Pindar. As models in their department of Poetry, his Satires are unsurpassed. Yet, without the earnestness and power of some of his successors, they rather provoke a smile, than move you with disgust at vice, or indignation at wrong. His "Ars Poetica" is replete with suggestion and instruction—almost perfect in its plan and its execution. Yet you feel that it was coldly composed rather to please the writer than benefit the reader. Yet just these peculiarities of his genius have secured him immortality. Men wish rather to be amused than instructed. They prefer a momentary pleasure to a lasting impression. Hence, the intellectual epicure discovers in Horace whatever can charm his taste, or please his fancy, and no Poet has more perfectly achieved success in all to which he himself aspired. In this respect his popularity is as deserved as it is universal, and will prove immortal.

We would have selected Lord Lytton, rather than any other person living to translate Horace. His "Introduction" exhibits a most lively and enthusiastic appreciation of his Roman idol. He himself is at once a man of letters, and a man of the world. He has both the instincts and the culture of the Poet. He has studied life in London, as Horace studied life in Rome. Such are his supposed qualifications for his work, that the announcement of his enterprise would be considered a prophecy of his success. But we fear the world will be disappointed. In some of his translations a more entire failure would scarcely be possible, nor a more entire departure from all his own just conceptions of the genius of the great Latin Bard. Nothing so charms in Horace as an inexplicable naïve elegance. His language is always simple, while always polished, and always musical. On the contrary in the very first Ode which Lord Lytton has translated, we find a stilt[illegible] sometimes an almost tragic

turgidity. The words are not only imposing, but *imposed*, since they express ideas of which you discover not the slightest trace in the original. We see more of the English novelist than the Latin Poet. Horace appears rather disguised in a paraphrase than expressed in a translation. Nor are we unwilling to submit our assertions to the severest test. Take the first line of the first Ode; Horace sings:

"Mæcenas, atavis edite regibus."

Lord Lytton renders,

"Sprung from a *race* which *mounts* to kings, Mæcenas."

While the line artistically bears no resemblance to the original, two foreign conceptions are introduced. Horace sings,

"Sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympicum
Collegisse juvat."

Lord Lytton renders,

"There are those whose sovereign joy is dust Olympic
Gathered in whirlwind by the car."

Here the first line is insufferably stilted, and unnatural, and the second expresses likewise an idea of which there is not a trace in the text.

"Palmaque nobilis," is translated, "the palm's noble *trophy*," and "Si Mobilium turba Quiritium," "the mob of Rome's *electors* fickle." "Nauta sed mare," becomes "to *indent a furrow*." "Metuens" is rendered "seized by *dismay*," and to "Africum" are added "blasts," and "storming," without the least warrant from the original. We have this entire line inserted with scarcely a hint in Horace to authorize the intrusion.

"Nestled in fields beside his native town."

The simple words,

"et litus tubæ
Permixtus sonitus,"

are tortured into "clarion *shrill, deep* trumpet *commingling stormy melodies*."

But worse still when we have for

"Nunc ad aquæ lene caput sacræ."

"Now by soft well-head of *nymph-hallow'd* streams."

Where the last epithet has nothing whatever in the Latin to suggest its interpolation.

Now behold the climax!

Horace simply says:

"Sublimi feriam sidera vertice."

How chaste, how unpretentious, how musical!

Lord Lytton translates,

"With *crest* uplifted I shall strike the stars."

How stiff, how sophomoric, how distasteful! If Bulwer had not established a deserved reputation by his admirable essays, and successful dramas, we should characterize such work as literary pretence. It is musical Latin transformed into stilted English. Horace so attired resembles an image of simple beauty in chaste marble loaded with gilt ornaments, and decked with inharmonious colors.

JUVENTUS MUNDI. The Gods and Men of the heroic Age. By the RIGHT HONORABLE WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1869.

Few men have ever excited greater storms in a nation than the present Premier of England. He has shaken not only society, but the very throne to its foundations. It is not for us to inquire whether the motives of his policy have been pure, or whether the revolution he has inaugurated will be beneficial to Church and State. While all appearances indicate a selfish ambition, resolved on power at any price, yet Mr. Gladstone may have been animated by a large and profound statesmanship, reading the future with prophetic glance, and endeavoring to avoid anticipated ruin by timely concession. Whatever his motives, we would not forget the politician in the author. It is a marvel that any man could have the calmness to prepare such a work as the "Juventus Mundi," amid the roar of the tempests he had himself excited, and on the very crests of the billows which were sweeping over the nation. It certainly exhibits much profound investigation, and abounds in many original observations, and will greatly assist in shedding light on Homer, precisely on points where not much has been written. We are glad Mr. Gladstone so decidedly defends the unity of authorship, both as regards the Illiad, and the Odyssey, which he thinks sustained by overwhelming proof, especially as supplied from

> "The innumerable particulars of the manners, institutions, and ideas, which pervade both Poems, with a marvellous consistency, and by the incommunicable stamp of an extraordinary genius which they carry throughout. If discrepancies exist, the difficulty they present is not only small, but infinitesimal, compared with the difficulty of that hypothesis which assumes that Greece produced in early times a multitude of Homers, and all of them with the very same stamp of mind. Whether in short we consider these works as poetry or record, the marks of the unity are innumerable, and ineffacable. A part of their force is sensible to the ordinary reader, but it will be felt constantly, and immensely to increase in proportion as the reader becomes the student by virtue of a patient, constant, and thorough examination of the text."

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF. By S. BARING GOULD, author of "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages," etc. Part I. Heathenism and Mosaism." New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1870, pp. 414.

The author of this work wishes it to be distinctly understood that, in pursuing his inquiry, he has proceeded on purely positive grounds, assuming neither the existence of a God nor a Revelation of His will, depending rather for everything upon the strength of philosophic demonstration. So thoroughly has he divested himself of the language and methods of the theologian, that one critic, knowing nothing of Mr. Gould's relation to the advanced Ritualists, remarks that, "For anything that appears in his work, he may be one of the most devout of men." At the outset he plunges into physiology and the correlation of forces, seeking to ascertain the seat of the religious faculty. And as Paley hints that happiness is a certain state of the "nervous network lining the whole region of the præcordia," so, Mr. Gould tells us that religion is the co-ordination of the mind and sentiment, a union of subjectivity and objectivity in a common work, and the equal and harmonious de-

velopment of "the cerebrum and the sensory ganglionic tract," and so on. Having settled upon the seat of religion, he asks for the origin of religious belief, which is found, in brief, where the soul of man reaches out after perfection, and thus arrives at the idea of God. Immortality is next explained by the apparent necessity for justice, and for a state in which the unbalanced accounts of this life may be righted. Furnished with an immortal future and an efficient God, a name is next sought for the Deity, which the different religionists fix chiefly according to the Divine Attributes, the idea of God kindled in the breast of man, fairly exploding in terminology, coruscating in fable, and strewing the globe with sparks of truth and ashes of superstition.

Next, the author shows the adventitious nature of religious development, and then passes on to the origin of polytheism, which is found in the inevitable tendency to classify the forces of nature; afterwards assigning a reason for the cultivation of mythology, which is helped on by a forgetfulness of the signification of words and by an accumulation of similitudes. Idolatry is next shown to be a helpful thing; theocracy is represented as naturally springing up. Having proceeded thus far, a system of ethics comes as a matter of course; and, finally, science and culture lead to monotheism, which is followed by Pantheism and theosophy, after which he comes to treat the idea of evil. This he teaches is a generalization from the perception of pain. Asceticism and monasticism follow in their order, being suggested by the alleged fact that self-denial is the law of human nature. In treating of Sacrifice, he scouts the notion that it found its origin "in the consciousness of sin, and of a need of expiation through the shedding of blood." It arose from the simple and natural feeling that when wrong was done, restitution should be made, a principle which pervaded the legislation of all the ancient people. Sacraments were the logical results of a belief in God, having been resorted to by all nations; and in the progress of human society, the necessity of ideals is felt, which leads the way to hero worship, modern Roman Mariolatry, being thus "a religious development in obedience to law."

Such, in brief, is the idea of this author, who quotes the Bible, not as a final authority, but as a historic record open to criticism. The truth of revelation is a question that he does not touch, holding that we have a revelation in our own nature.

His right to treat the subject in this way can only be tolerated on the supposition that, if religion cannot be exhibited as a normal development of man's nature, it would seem almost useless to discuss it at all.

We understand Mr. Gould as appealing largely to that class of readers and thinkers who would have laid down his book at the start, if they had found him coming to meet them, clad in the robes and using the language of the professional priest. And this class is a large one; in fact, it is daily growing in numbers and importance. He therefore deems it necessary to meet them, and condemn them, as it were, out of their own mouths, showing that religion is a development of man, and that unbelief is unnatural.

How far Mr. Gould has succeeded we do not pretend here to say, though we cannot help feeling (perhaps it is our prejudice) that he has surrendered something in the course of the discussion; or, at least, that he has let

Christian Sacraments, in some instances, theoretically, down to the level of then superstition. But, however this may be, the work is the result of rning, and research throughout the principal fields of knowledge. The style, thout being brilliant, is lively and agreeable; and, on the whole, the readers the REVIEW will be greatly interested, and, perhaps, profited by its perusal. e present volume will be followed by a second, which deals distinctly with e origin of that part of the world's religious belief, embodied in the atem of Christianity.

N SOME POINTS IN CERTAIN THEORIES CONCERNING THE PURPOSE AND PRIMAL CONDITION OF THE GREAT PYRAMID OF JEESEH:—Being a paper read to the Philosophical Society of Glasgow, Feb. 1868. By ST. JOHN VINCENT DAY, C. E., etc.: and in Chief Part, a Reply to a Lecture delivered to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Jan 20, 1868. By SIR J. Y. SIMPSON, Bart., M. D. Glasgow: Bell & Bain.

EMARKS ON TWO PYRAMID PAPERS IN THE LAST PUBLISHED NUMBERS OF THE "PROCEEDINGS" OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF EDINBURGH. By PROF. PIAZZI SMYTH, Astronomer Royal for Scotland. Edinburgh: Neil & Co.

AVELS IN MANY LANDS. By H. J. K. P., a Volunteer Colporteur, July, 1869.

IE GREAT PYRAMID OF EGYPT; ITS STORY. By W. COWPER.

Since the composition of the Article on "The Great Pyramid," which apared in the last April number of the REVIEW, the above publications, with iers, have come to hand, sustaining, very satisfactorily, the remarkable coinences illustrated in the Article referred to. Prof. Smyth replies in an able nner to the unscientific objections of Sir J. Y. Simpson, while Mr. Day goes er the whole subject very clearly and impartially. He also gives some value illustrations in the appendix, which serve to show most conclusively that pyramidal structures found in various parts of the world, bear no relation atever to the Great Pyramid of Egypt.

Prof. Smyth also discusses the positions of Sir Henry James, who now stands the head of the Corps of British Engineers, and who is, perhaps, at present, chief recognised opponent of the new Pyramidal theory. Col. James k upon himself the demolition of this theory with great zeal, in the confince of achieving an easy victory. His object was, first, to fault Prof. Smyth's easures of the Pyramid base line. And while Sir James is unquestionably a perior engineer, having been alluded to recently in a leading periodical as One of the greatest living authorities on any question of measurement," he, vertheless, occasionally handles the measuring rod in an unskilful manner. fact, early last year, he suddenly discovered an error in Prof. Smyth's meares of the base line of Jeeseh, amounting to no less than *sixteen feet.* But the end of three months, however, he was driven to confess, not without ame (See *Athenæum*, No. 2,160, 1869) that he had himself fallen into a grave ror. Thus, Prof. Smyth's calculations were left, practically, intact. The ibsequent measures of the Royal Engineers, made on their return from Sinai.

at the expense of Miss Burdett Coutts, are quite as harmless as the calculations of Sir Henry James.

It is worthy of notice, in connection with these documents, that one essential feature of the Pyramid theory has already been adopted, and, strange to say, by Sir Henry himself, who entertains the deepest hostility to Prof. Smyth's views. We allude to the distinction in the Pyramid theory between the sacred cubit of the Jews and the profane cubit of Memphis, a distinction first brought out by Sir Isaac Newton, and maintained by the late John Taylor, and by Prof. Smyth. To the astonishment of every one, this distinction, which has so long been battled for, appears in the new map of the Jerusalem Survey, and with the sanction of Sir Henry James. The fact is certainly significant.

The above documents, which have been made the occasion of these remarks, are worthy of careful study on the part of those who are interested in pursuing this profoundly interesting question, which is destined, as time advances, to claim a very large share of public attention on both sides of the Atlantic. If the metrical theory is true, we certainly desire to feel assured of the fact; yet, if it should turn out false, there would still be left a residuum of grand and indestructible facts, with which to lay the basis of some different explanation of the meaning of Jeeseh.

EVENINGS WITH THE SACRED POETS. A Series of Quiet Talks about the Singers and their Songs. By the author of "The Festival of Song," "Salad for the Solitary," &c., &c. A. D. F. Randolph & Co., New York. Crown 8vo. pp. 495. 1870.

Evenings with the Sacred Poets, means Evenings spent in the most exalted society. It means, communion with the great and good of all ages and all lands. In connection with such a theme, the Christian man must feel more deeply than ever the value of the art of printing, which annihilates time, brings back the dead, and enables him to assemble at instant call the illustrious company whose names are associated with Sacred Song. Thus David becomes a guest, Bernard of Clugny, a companion, and Herbert a friend, the first and the last of the tuneful line uniting as it were, of an evening around the ingle.

Before Mr. Saunders undertook this work, there were books without number devoted to Sacred Poetry, and yet there was still a department left unoccupied. This has now been filled by a work which is neither a compilation of Sacred songs nor a bald index; but, pursuing a happy medium between the two extremes, it forms an agreeable companion and guide through the maze of religious hymns that have been given to the world during the ages all along, from David the sweet singer of Israel until now. We are conducted down through the early Greek and Latin writers, thence to the Mediævalists, on through the Reformation era, delaying to glance at the poetry of the Thirty Years' War, together with specimens of the Swedish, French, and Spanish verse. The closing sections bear on the early and later English song-smiths, in connection with the modern English and American; thus giving within the same covers the choicest things both new and old.

This work contains but few poems, entire, as the object of the author was rather to indicate the sources from which fuller material may be drawn, and to

:ite a desire for a more intimate and extended acquaintance than could be ·ived from the perusal of one or two complete songs. In pursuing his work, r. Saunders has allowed the literary element to have its full representation; t if poetry is held subordinate to religion, scientific theology is, in turn, held bordinate to essential Christianity.

It is also pleasing to note that those parts which necessarily refer to the ffering of Christ are managed with delicacy and skill, thus relieving the ss of many repulsive features that morbid minds have often grouped around

The author does not err with that distinguished modern artist who refuses paint the Crucifixion at all, and who prefers to *suggest* the tragedy by repenting Mary weeping at the foot of the Cross, holding the crown of thorns her hand; yet Jesus is lifted up to view with becoming consideration for ned human feelings, His sufferings being sung in this volume by those poets o were able to see something besides anguish in the tragedy of the Cross. riolatry, likewise, is properly kept in the back-ground, as this work makes appeal to either the advocates or imitators of the Church of Rome. It nevheless possesses the essential of universality and is redolent with the conmed sentiments and expression of every age. The best songs of the best gers are almost invariably brought to illustrate the feeling and poetic wer of their times, and undue favoritism has little or no place on the beaual printed pages of this choice volume. We could indeed mention faults well as omissions; yet, as they are such as will readily suggest themselves to author's mind, and find ample correction in future editions, we pass them by d indulge in the more agreeable work of pointing out the pervading excelce. As a whole, we can honestly commend Mr. Saunders' work, which is aracterized by refinement, taste and general good judgment.

ALTER OGILBY. A Novel. By the Authoress of "Wau-Bun." Two Volumes in one. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1869. 12mo. pp. 619.

This is a pleasant story, told with much earnestness and sincerity and with very evident desire to do good. The authoress appears to be a devout hurchwoman, and teaches nothing that we cannot all commend. What some the characters lack in strength they often make up in goodness, and readers ill generally feel benefited by the perusal of the book.

LD HORSE GRAY, AND THE PARISH OF GRUMBLETON. BY EDWARD HOPPER. Respectfully dedicated to the merciful Philozoist, Henry Bergh. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton, 1869, 12mo., pp. 82.

This little effort in verse comes to us from one who has formerly done somehat better. As a poetical production, we cannot give it any praise, yet the ject in view must win for the author the sympathy of all who take up this ork, which is devoted to an exhibition of the heartlessness and injustice with hich aged clergymen are often treated by their Parishes. Like "Old Horse ray," they are often turned out, at last, to die. Their efficiency being at an d, they are of no further interest or use. The evil presented by the author one with which we are all too familiar, and for which we nevertheless find it difcult to provide a sufficient remedy. How sad to see a venerable Priest of od reduced to beggary in his old age! Manifestly, it is the duty of every

Parish to provide for the last days of those who have borne the burden and the heat of the day, and served at the altar faithfully and well. If this piece of verse, scattered among the people at large, has any influence in calling their attention to the evil, the Riverside Press will not have labored in vain.

NAVIGATIONS FRANCAISES ET LA REVOLUTION MARITIME. Du XIXth au XVIth Siecle, d'apres les documens inedits tires de France, d'Aangleterre, d'Espagne, et d'Italie. Par PIERRE MARGRY. Paris: E. Tross, 1869, 8vo.

This work, by M. Margry, is one of wide interest, decided ability, and much importance, being also the result of patient study and research. The author's views have been challenged, where he claims the discovery of the African Coast by the French, in the fourteenth century; yet, Mr. Major, author of "Prince Henry the Navigator," does not overturn the facts as presented by M. Margry.

The chief point of interest, however, for American students is found in the author's account of the Life and Works of the Navigator, Jean Allfonsce, a man of much ability and worth, and who was, nevertheless, very generally unknown. Jean Allfonsce was born in the French province of Saintonge, though we cannot state exactly when. He followed the sea for a period of more than forty years, and made many voyages to Brazil in the service of the Portuguese. In 1542, he came out to America as the Chief Pilot of Roberval. His death took place before the year 1559, and his fame was sung by Melin de Saint Gelais, a distinguished poet and son of the Bishop of Angouleme. His voyage to Canada with Roberval was signalized by a visit to the coast of New England, when he probably discovered Massachusetts Bay, sixty years before the time of Gosnold, and seventy-eight years before the landing of the Puritans; a fact that has not hitherto been known by historical students, who have been obliged, heretofore, to depend for their knowledge of Allfonsce upon a garbled and distorted account of that navigator's work, put out by a careless bookseller. M. Margry has done good service by giving us a pretty full account of the writings of the navigator, from his own manuscript, preserved in the Imperial Library, at Paris. One passage from Allfonsce's work is so interesting to students of American history that we desire to put it on record here:

Ces terres tiennent à la Tartarie, et pense que ce se soit le bout de l'Asie sel[illegible] la rondeur du monde. Et pour ce il seroit bon avoir ung navire petit de so[illegible] ante et dix tonneaux pour descouvrir la coste de la Fleuride, car j'ag esté à u[illegible] baye jusques à 42 degrès, entre Norembeque et le Fleuride, mais n'ay pas t[illegible] du tout le fond et ne sçay pas s'il passe plus avant.

This passage conveys the quite common notion of the time that America w[illegible] connected with Asia, advises the exploration of the coast from New Englan[illegible] or Norembeque, to the peninsula of Florida, which gave the name to the who[illegible] region, and states the important fact that he visited a great bay in latitude 4[illegible] degrees North, which must have been Massachusetts Bay, as Allfonsce was a accomplished mariner, and could give latitudes by the astrolabe.

We are under great obligation to Mr. Margry for his careful and pains-takin[illegible] studies of Allfonsce, in connection with other subjects contained in his wor[illegible] doing justice to the Pilots of Pentagruel, of whom Jean Allfonsce was one. Th[illegible]

: forms a solid addition to historical literature, and should become general-
ıown to historical students, who cannot fail to derive large benefits from
tudies of the learned and accomplished author.

NE HISTORICAL COLLECTIONS. Volume I. New Series. Portland, 1869.
o.

is is a well meaning work that was looked forward to with much interest
the day of its announcement. It is the result of a liberal expenditure on
art of the Maine Legislature, and we expected to find in it a mine of val-
› material. We were however disappointed in a great measure. But
ıparatively small part of the work relates to Maine, and here we do not
a single reliable voyage. The book was thrown together in haste, and
the maps by which it is accompanied are unfaithful copies. The work is
great measure a notable failure, and one that is hardly pleasant to contem-
. We had a right to expect something better, especially as a genuine
ent was called in to perform the bulk of the work. The editor has praised
production without stint in the prefatory portions, but something of the
ɔ of the opinion is shown by his notes, especially on page 170, where he says
we are indebted to Dr. Kohl, for "new light from the Portuguese Archives
ive to the Cortereal voyages." This information was given, among others,
Damiano in the sixteenth century; also by Bishop Orosius, translated by
s in 1752. Purchas was familiar with the three Cortereal voyages, as was
r Heylin. In fact, we read the editor's statements with a sort of
ler that they could ever have been written; for the Maine Historical Society
; at *least* own as much as the works of Purchas. The fact that Mr. Ban-
knew nothing of these voyages is no evidence that they were *new*. Among
ents who believe in going to the foundation of things, Mr. Bancroft is fast
ming *passé*.
ıt though we can say very little in favor of *this* volume of the Maine His-
al Society, we hope that the next, which is to conclude an original manu-
t by that great student and patron of our early history, the Rev. Richard
luyt, will prove more acceptable. We are sure that the worthy and labor-
students who are now at work on it will do their best.

NS OF THE HIGHER LIFE. New York, Broughton & Wyman, 1870. 24mo.

y book ought to be welcome that is so largely calculated as this to
en aspirations in the soul for the higher life. Its neat and compact form
rs it a *vade mecum*, every way desirable for the devout man, who will find
ounding in spiritual thoughts happily expressed.

ONS. By REV. RUSSELL TREVETT, D. D. Late Professor of St. John's
lege, Annapolis, Maryland. New York, A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 1870.
no.

is is a very interesting memorial of a good man. The list of subjects is at-
ve, and Bishop Kerfoot furnishes a prefatory note concerning his late frieud,
Trevett. It will be sought after and treasured by those formerly attendant

upon the author's able ministrations. The likeness of Dr. Trevett, forming the frontispiece, is considered a good one.

THE PSALTER AND THE SELECTION OF PSALMS, POINTED FOR CHANTING WITH THE DAILY PRAYERS AND LITANY. By JAMES PEARCE, Mus. Bac. Oxon. Philadelphia: R. M'Cauley, 1870. 16mo.: pp. 302.

THE CHURCH HYMNAL. A Collection of Hymns, from the Prayer Book Hymnal, Additional Hymns, Hymns Ancient and Modern, and Hymns for Church and Home. For use in Churches where Licensed by the Bishop. Philadelphia: R. McCauley, 1870. 16mo.: pp. 396.

"COMMON PRAISE." A Tribute to Congregational Music. In Four Part Harmonies. Adapted to any Book of Psalms and Hymns. By REV. J. H. WATERBURY. Chants, Tunes, Hymns and Psalter. Eighth Edition. Enlarged. D. M. Dewey. Rochester: New York, 1869. 12mo.

The second of these books has yet to find general acceptance; but the other two will be found useful at once, in parishes where the styles of music prevail which they are intended to develop. They all appear to be well prepared, and promise to prove useful helps.

THE PURSUIT OF HOLINESS: A SEQUEL TO "THOUGHTS ON PERSONAL RELIGION." Intended to carry the Reader somewhat further on in the Spiritual Life. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D. D., Dean of Norwich. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1870. 16mo.: pp. 261.

The name of this writer has now come to be almost a household word in a large number of Christian families, scattered all over our land. Anything from his pen might be passed upon in advance as necessarily valuable. The title of the book describes it; but on looking within, we find that it is rich in thought, eminently devout in spirit, and withal, entirely practical. We can only hope to see the number of writers of this class constantly increasing in the Church, for, with the development of a deeper spirituality, will come an increased power with the world.

A TEXT BOOK OF CHEMISTRY. A Modern and Systematic Explanation of the Elementary Principles of Science. Adapted to Use in High Schools and Academies. By LEROY C. COOLEY, A. M., Professor of Natural Science in the New York State Normal School, &c. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1869. 12mo., pp. 232.

We have examined this elementary work with a great deal of interest, and judge that a trial in the recitation room would demonstrate its adaptation to the end designed. The plan is simple, the language clear, and the illustrations good. This is what it purports to be; namely, a work on "Chemistry," the subject not being mixed up, as is sometimes the case, with a number of cognate sciences. The experiments introduced are all very interesting, and sometimes they are very beautiful. The book represents the present condition of the science, and includes an explanation of the Spectroscope, by which, we are now able to determine with certainty many of the elements which constitute the body of the Sun. We commend the book to the attention of teachers.

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—JULY, 1870.—No. 2.

ART. I.—AMERICAN POETRY.

Hymns and Sacred Pieces, with Miscellaneous Poems. BY RAY PALMER. *New York: Anson D. F. Randolph.* 1865.

Hymns of My Holy Hours. BY RAY PALMER. *New York: Anson D. F. Randolph.* 1868.

Christian Ballads. BY THE RT. REV. ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE, D.D., *with Corrections and Additions. Fifteenth Edition. Philadelphia: Richard McCauley,* 1314 *Chestnut St.* 1869.

The Cathedral. BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL. *Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co.* 1870.

POETRY, in a recent number of a popular American monthly, has, in all its various departments, been reduced to mere rhythmical history. Certainly such a limitation must be received with qualification. Hitherto definitions of the Divine Art have been so numerous and so unsatisfactory that it seems almost needless and presumptuous to discuss the subject. Macaulay once affirmed that Poetry originated in an absolute mental illusion, thus forever divorcing Beauty from Truth. Modern rationalists assert that the afflatus of the genius is identical with the inspiration of the Prophet. Can reason discover between such extremes no simple theory which

shall unwind this tangled skein of critical and philosophical generalization? We will only venture a few suggestions before proceeding to the principal subject of our Article.

Take a glowing description from the pages of one of Sir Walter Scott's novels, and retaining each image, so translate it that it shall fulfill every condition of rhythm and metre. Is the result Poetry? Evidently not. You have merely Prose in verse. All productions not springing from a certain state of ardent mental excitement, belong to the same category. Addresses on an assigned theme, and for a specified occasion, although obviously definable as rhythmical descriptions, yet are painfully deficient in every characteristic of genuine Poetry. What then is the peculiar intellectual condition which has been figuratively styled inspiration, and which is essential to that verse enshrining itself in the soul of humanity? This question, properly answered, may lead us at least to a clearer comprehension of a disputed subject.

Let us imagine that there is before the mind of the Poet a golden field, a wild cataract, a wide river, a sublime mountain, the illimitable ocean, the encircling sky, a deed of personal heroism, the engagement of a mighty battle—any scene from nature or event from history tending to stir the heart, or excite the fancy. Now there are two methods of impressing his conceptions on others. He may choose a cool and elaborate presentation of details, which, whether in the form of verse, or otherwise, is essentially Prose. Or, with the whole scene glowing before his imagination, he may by the instincts of genius, seize a few suggestive thoughts, and expressing them in rhythmical words, give his production the immortal impress of Poetry. Here then we perceive two necessary conditions. There must be the power to catch the characteristic idea, and the power to weave it into verse. It is this happy selection and happy expression, the joint results of genius and of culture, which give to Poetry its fire, its power, its concentration, its music, and lift it into a lofty region, styled in figure inspiration, and forever above the unimpassioned, and labored, and minute descriptions of Prose. And it is similar intellectual conditions and operations, which give to Oratory its glory, and beauty, and persuasiveness, and elevate it to a noble position far beyond the attainment of the speaker, who, without the gifts of delicate perception, exquisite language, and instinctive sympathy, presents us only with the elaboration and

ryness of detailed argumentation. The sisterhood of these im-
ortal Arts, is also evinced by the fact that the one is allied to the
›ice in music, as the other is allied to the voice in elocution.

We might take our illustrations from a battle of Homer, an ode
' Anacreon, a lyric of Pindar, a line of Horace, a description of
irgil. We might press into our service a picture from Dante, or
riosto, or Tasso, or Petrarch. We might borrow from the pages
' Milton, or Shakspeare, or Thomson, or Cowper, or Byron, or
cott, or Tennyson. Nothing could more entirely answer our pur-
›se than the matchless "Forest Hymn," of our own Bryant, or
ıe exquisite "Psalm of Life," by our own Longfellow. It better
ıits our plan, at present, to select from the works of those au-
ıors whose names introduce our Article.

Dr. Ray Palmer is a Congregational Divine. He possesses a
horough culture, a clear intellect, warm Christian affections, a sensi-
ility more delicate than ardent, and a fancy more correct than soar-
ng. A peculiar placidity pervades his Poems, resulting from a mind
onsciously and largely cultivated, and a heart at rest in the Sa-
iour. They resemble a calm field bathed in the evening sunshine.
Fou scarcely ever detect in them one instance of forced rhyme, or
mperfect metre. Everywhere is visible the polish of a true taste.
Dr. Palmer's Poems are mostly religious, and connect your heart
rith the great doctrines of Christianity which centre in the cross
nd throne of our Lord Jesus Christ. Each Hymn in the collec-
ions before us is pleasing, and musical, and edifying. But in only
ne single instance is the highest excellence attained, and thus af-
ords an admirable illustration of the theory we have suggested.
The Hymn to which we allude is one of the finest in the English
anguage, and translated into numerous tongues, makes part of the
rorship of our world. The Christian lyric requires a certain se-
ene glow, and calm elevation which pervade this exquisite pro-
uction, while its music is all that the most critical ear can demand.
Vhy has it taken its place in the consciousness and literature of
Christendom? Not at all on account of the fire or originality of
ts thoughts. The whole secret is in the selection of that which
nost universally touches a chord in the pious heart, and its proper
xpression in rhythmical language.

But without pausing to quote from Dr. Palmer, we will pass to
he Ballads of Bishop Coxe. We are at once struck with the tran-

sition. In the Congregational Divine we observe that genius of Calvinism, which, abstracting itself from the visible and the temporal, becomes absorbed in the universal and the eternal verities of the Christian Religion. There is no appeal except to your higher spiritual sensibilities. Your gaze is usually directed from earth to heaven. On the other hand, our Bishop Coxe glows and kindles in view of the visible Church. The font, the altar, the chancel, the window, the aisle, the spire, the cross, the surplice, the priest, the grave-yard, the bell, are all pictured in his song, which transports you at once into the domain of human thought and feeling. The Christian Ballad burns and palpitates with the fire and life of a Christian manhood. With occasional defects, and a censurable uniformity of metre, we know nothing in our language which could replace this volume of Bishop Coxe. It unites the simplicity and energy required by this style of composition, and seems almost a creation in its department of Christian Literature. Let us also show how completely it confirms the theory of our Article. Place a modern novelist on the shore of Lake George! He is in search of a description for a promised story. You can easily conceive his tiresome and tasteless delineation of the various objects which salute his eye, and if he should convert his common place into the most artistic verse, he would give you but tedious Prose. Now turn to the Poem in the volume of "Christian Ballads," entitled "S[illegible]. Sacrament!" Select the fourth stanza!

> "An hour—and though the even-star
> Was chasing down the sun,
> My boat was on thine azure wave,
> Sweet, holy Horicon!
> And woman's voice cheered on our bark,
> With soft bewildering song,
> While fire-flies darting through the dark,
> Went lighting us along."

Here before the soul of the Poet was a vivid, glowing, inspiring picture of the entire scene! Where was evinced the genius of his description? Not in crowding all the images furnished to conception on his canvass, but by the delicacy of a true instinct, in choosing those which will suggest the whole to the imagination, and then by the music of his verse, making his thoughts tuneful for the ear, and impressive for the memory.

The three following verses contain many admirable illustrations

of what we have advanced, and indeed almost any stanza of the Poem might be adduced, not only in proof of a theory, but as an example of poetic creation, poetic fire, and poetic expression.

"Anon that bark was on the beach,
And soon I stood alone
Upon thy mouldering walls, Fort George,
So old, and ivy-grown.
At once old tales of massacre
Were crowding on my soul,
And ghosts of ancient sentinels,
Paced up the rocky knoll.

"The shadowy hour was dark, enow
For Fancy's wild campaign;
And moments were impassioned hours
Of battle and of pain.
Each barbed thistle seemed alive
With fearful shapes of fight;
And up the feathered scalp locks rose,
Of many a tawny sprite.

"The Mohawk war-whoop howled again;
I heard St. Denys' charge;
And then the volleyed musketry
Of England and St. George.
The vale, the cradling hills,
From echoing rank to rank,
Rang back the war-like rhetoric
Of Huron and of Frank."

With such possibilities of the very highest attainment in the Christian Ballad as this volume evinces, we should regret that the genius of the author had not been consecrated to the Poetic Art, if we did not know that his powers have found a nobler field in the Holy Church, and that when the earthly laurel fades, the heavenly crown will be brightening in eternal light. Before, however, dismissing the book we cannot forbear quoting some other beautiful stanzas, in a more tender and pathetic vein. The first one taken from the Poem called "Church-yards."

"Our mother the Church hath never a child
To honor before the rest,
But she singeth the same for mighty kings
And the veriest babe on her breast.
And the Bishop goes down to his narrow bed
As the ploughman's child is laid,
And alike she blesseth the dark-brown serf
And the chief in his robe arrayed."

"I never can see a green church-yard
But I think I may slumber there,
And I wonder within me what strange disease
Shall bring me to homes so fair."
"I know I may burn to ashes soon
With this feverish flame of life,
Or the flickering lamp may soon blaze out
With its dying self at strife."

"And here—I think—when they lay me down
How strange will my slumber be;
The cold, cold clay for my dreamless head,
And the turf for my canopy.
How stilly will creep the long, long years
O'er my quiet sleep away,
And, oh what a waking that sleep will know
At the peal of the Judgment-day."

From the Poem called "I LOVE THE CHURCH," we will give a single extract, containing as many sweet, tranquil, beautiful images as can be found in any verse of any Ballad, English or American.

"The dead in Christ—they rest in hope,
And o'er their sleep sublime,
The shadow of the steeple moves
From morn to vesper chime.
On every mound, in solemn shade,
Its imaged cross doth lie,
As goes the sunlight to the west,
Or rides the moon on high."

And now the aim of our Article compels us to consider the recent Poem of James Russell Lowell, called "THE CATHEDRAL." The fame of this writer is not perhaps more extensive than might be expected from his undoubted genius. His range of talent is wide, his culture is diversified, and his mind essentially creative. Perhaps no American author possesses higher natural gifts. "The Biglow Papers," sparkle with wit, and seem the very concentration and culmination of ages of New England humor and shrewdness. While venerating Shakspeare for his unrivalled delineations of character, we could never admire his plot, or enjoy his wit. Pope's satire while polished is deadly. Sir Walter Scott wakes the smile but rarely the laugh. Washington Irving with his exquisite delicacy of touch, excites pleasurably but gently your sense of the ludicrous. Dickens if often inimitable is often monotonous. But Lowell has such an exhaustless wealth of fun, shows such shrewd

observation of our national character, exhibits such a thorough penetration into New England peculiarities, displays such an admirable acquaintance with the human heart, glitters with such a sparkling brilliance of wit, and yet evinces such genial sympathies with his race, and such a sturdy opposition to wrong, that read his humorous pieces when you will, in the solitude of your room, or in the circle of your family, you may always experience the joy, and the benefit of refreshing laughter, while, notwithstanding the vulgarism of the style, you are elevated into a greater love for truth, and right. His strength, and fame are in the very productions which he himself is perhaps inclined to undervalue, and despise. There is indeed not a Poem of Mr. Lowell's which does not abound in striking thoughts, in pleasing sentiments, and beautiful imagery. He has large sympathies with man and nature, and no American Poet has superior general talents. Yet in all his serious verses you perceive so many defects marring so many excellencies, crudities and beauties so often allied, bad taste and exquisite sensibility in such frequent conjunction, that, either from carelessness or idiosyncrasy, you feel that the author in the highest departments of his Art has in no instance reached its highest standard. Mr. Lowell in this sense is a Poet rather in possibility than achievement, and all his worst faults are concentrated, and exaggerated in his "Cathedral." It seldom evinces either the insight, or the expression of genius. Take the first two lines as furnishing proof of our assertion. Think of "a happy-day" "*downshod.*" Mr. Lowell might transfer such an incongruity to his "Fable for Critics." What imaginable sense in these lines?

> "As to a bee the new campanula's
> *Illuminate seclusion swung in air.*"

Seclusion illuminated! Seclusion swung! Seclusion apprehended by a bee! Other violations of taste, and metre are too numerous for mention. With a venerable Cathedral in every part—pavement, pillar, window, altar, organ, spire breathing, and speaking with genius—lifting itself to the skies through the centuries as for a monument to the faith—associated with so many of the hopes, and fears of humanity—a temple of earth pointing towards Heaven—so full of awe, and solemnity, and grandeur—refining, purifying, exalting the contemplative soul—with such an edifice we could scarcely expect a Poet having true instincts could con-

nect the vulgar, and the common-place. Such a fault or such a theme is even more censurable than anything in the "New England Tragedies." Yet we find in the "Cathedral" these lines certainly revolting to good taste, and a departure from the whole genius of such a Poem.

> "In this brown-fisted, rough, this shirt-sleeved Cid,
> This backwoods Charlemagne of empires new,
> Whose blundering foot instinctively finds out
> The goutier foot of speechless dignities,
> Who meeting Cæsar's self, would slap his back,
> Call him '*Old Horse*' and *challenge to a drink*,
> My lungs draw braver air, my breast dilates
> With ampler manhood."

We are at a loss to conceive whether the brown-fist, the shirt-sleeve, the slap, the title, or the cup here inspires Mr. Lowell with such swelling, and noble sentiments.

But we must hasten to a sadder view of this Poem. The verse of Dr. Palmer everywhere exhibits the serene glow of an immortal Christian hope. He sings a present Saviour. He kindles with visions of Heaven. Peace, love, triumph breathe and burn, and burst when he touches the harp. His hymn on the "JOY OF CONSECRATION TO CHRIST" is full of cheerfulness, and praise.

> "Oh, sweetly breathes the lyre above
> When angels touch the quivering string,
> And wake, to chant Immanuel's love,
> Such strains as angels' lips can sing.
>
> "Jesus, Thy name our souls adore.
> We own the bond that makes us Thine,
> And carnal joys that charmed before,
> For Thy dear sake we now resign.
>
> "In Thee we trust—on Thee rely;
> Though we are feeble, Thou art strong;
> Oh, keep us till our spirits fly
> To join the bright immortal throng."

So also the "CHRISTIAN BALLADS," are constantly sounding exultant notes of hope, and faith, and victory. The Poet breaks forth:

> "I love the Church—the holy Church,
> The Saviour's spotless Bride;
> And Oh, I love her palaces
> Through all the land so wide;
> The cross-topped spire amid the trees,
> The holy bell of prayer,
> The music of our mother's voice,
> Our mother's home is there.

"The village tower—'tis joy to me;
I cry the Lord is here!
The village-bells—they fill my soul,
They more than fill mine ear.
O'er kingdoms to the Saviour won
Their triumph peal is hurl'd;
Their sound is now in all the earth;
Their words throughout the world."

But in the "Cathedral" of Mr. Lowell, we discover no such inspirations. A skepticism pervades the latter part of the Poem, cold as the walls, and gloomy as the aisles of the venerable pile he describes. It is the paralyzing and distracting *doubt* ever present to the soul, which is not cheered, and penetrated by beams from the face of a present Saviour, received, and trusted, and loved, and adored as Divine. We may notice here the marks of a Unitarian Theology traced unconsciously on a gifted spirit, which beneath those brilliant flashes of wit, delighting the world, yet discloses the shadows of sadness that darken every high intellectual nature not possessing rest, and hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, believed, and worshiped as God. The conclusion of the Poem, evidently only recognizing a Deity in nature, and intended to cast contempt on the supernatural of Revelation, shows in the soul of the writer an attempted persuasiveness to a faith consciously not enjoyed.

"Oh Power, more near than life itself,—
Even as the roots shut in the darksome earth,
Share in the tree-top's fragrance, and conceive
Of sunshine, and wide air, and wingëd things,
By sympathy of nature, so do I
Have evidence of Thee so far above,
Yet in, and of me!—Rather thou the root
Invisibly sustaining, hid in light—
I fear not Thy withdrawal; more I fear,
Seeing to know Thee not, hoodwinked with dreams
Of signs, and wonders, while, unnoticed, Thou,
Walking Thy garden still, commun'st with men,
Missed in the common-place of miracle."

The last line contains in itself sad proof of that genius of modern skepticism which everywhere assaults the supernatural of the Scriptures.

Having accomplished our object in considering together the Poems of Dr. Palmer, Bishop Coxe, and Mr. Lowell, we wish to conclude our Article with some more general reflections on AMERI-

CAN POETRY. But we will briefly turn back to the past before glancing down the future. As in the individual the gifts of insight, and expression must unite to produce supreme excellence in the Divine Art, so that epoch in a nation's history must most develop its poetic genius which exhibits the most vivid possible intensity with the most advanced possible culture. This is that precise point in the intellectual progress of a people which lies between the excessive wildness of youth, and the exacting maturity of age. It is the summit commanding the wide, varied glowing landscape, and dividing the region of Creative Art from the region of philosophical observation. On the one side of this favored altitude imagination is vigorous at the expense of culture, while on the other side culture has advanced at the expense of imagination. The extreme of fresh fancy is however more favorable to Poetry than the extreme of polished reason. The Book of Job—that most ancient of human compositions—is an example of this remark. In the age of the writer style had a sufficient, yet not its highest development. But the imagination of that youthful period glowed with a most intense ardor, and language had attained a capacity adequate to paint its vivid images. The very problems of Providence which are now discussed deliberately in the essay, and the sermon were then clothed with all the hues of fancy, and depicted in the Poem. Sublimity, not style reached its acme. The voice of the Almighty in the whirlwind, awing Job into nothingness by demanding explanation of the secrets of the universe, wakes in the soul such conceptions of terror, and power, and majesty as can never be exceeded. But so far as the perfection of mere style is considered, this was reserved for the later age of David, which exhibited all that was requisite for the loftiest acquirements of poetic art. The miracles of Egypt, and the Red Sea, and the wilderness were yet fresh in the national mind. The more cultivated manners of the city, and the more stately worship of the temple had not produced the effects visible in the reign of Solomon. Yet, while the perilous personal adventures of David, together with the marvels of Jewish history, conspired to invigorate, and vivify the song of the Master-Bard, everything in the Hebrew language was prepared for his mission. Poetic genius, and Poetic culture therefore culminated to Poetic Art in the verse of David. Then followed the more self-conscious, and labored, and philosophical career of Solomon, and after various phases through the prophetic ages.

there succeeded the cold dogmatisms of Scribe and Pharisee which finally chilled, and quenched the inspirations of Israel, considered in their merely human aspect.

Profoundly ignorant as we are of the previous preparatory discipline of the Grecian races in mind and language, we must recognize in Homer the most favorable conditions of Poetic development. He bursts upon us in all the fulness of his epic glory. Afterwards, during generations, from Athens as a center, issued the divinest radiance of song. The genius of the people, their fancied origin from gods, the scenery of the peninsula, the charm of the encircling sea, the images of a beautiful mythology, the struggles for liberty of small states against vast oriental dynasties, the inspiring contests of the sacred games, all contributed to prolong the period of fresh native vigor, while the matchless richness of a tuneful tongue also kept back the age of chilling, philosophical and critical disquisition, when scholars sighed amid the groves of the Academy, the statues of the Agora, and the marvels of the Parthenon for that epoch of creative art which they could investigate and admire, but never produce. Rome, catching inspiration from Greece, saw, springing from the enterprise which made a world tributary to the Empire of Augustus, those elements which formed a brilliant poetic history. Too soon, however, the labor of study dimmed the glow of song. Then for the Epic of Virgil, and the Lyric of Horace we have the dissertation of Seneca, and the generalization of Tacitus.

In England we can trace similar periodic phases. First come the Saxon terseness, simplicity and dramatic energy. Genius has sufficient strength but not sufficient culture. Fancy was creative long before language was prepared to give it form. Soon the treasures of Greece and Rome enlarged, and enriched the native vocabulary. The contests of the Church, the fierce fights of faction, the battles by sea and land with the continental nations, the terrible struggles of the Reformation in every part of Europe, brilliant visions opened by the discovery of an illimitable world, brightened and intensified the English mind, perpetuating its youthful vigor and ardor. The language of the people too was constantly advancing to perfection. Thus Shakespeare and Milton—the two masters of modern poetry—found in the intellectual atmosphere of their nation and their age everything which

could give inspiration to their genius, while in the strength of the Saxon, the harmoniousness of the Greek, and the majesty of the Latin, mingled and fused into one compacted tongue, were ready the necessary and varied elements for expressing feeling, and passion, and thought. In the subsequent periods of English Literature from the powerful verse of Dryden to the pleasing lines of Tennyson, we can mark successive epochs, when, as the creative, or the critical faculty predominates, we estimate the character of the different poetic schools and eras. Perhaps it may not be rash to venture the prediction that the Empire of Great Britain, so noble in its achievements for liberty and literature, has, both in sway and song, passed the meridian.

What then is the poetic future of America? We will restrict the inquiry to our own Republic.

Our heritage as a nation was the world's past. There was danger that creative genius would be stifled and oppressed by the very richness of its privileges. Perhaps never before did the life of a people begin with such intellectual advantages. The finest culture of English universities was not unfrequently transferred to the forests of America. The most courtly gentlemen and the most polished ladies were found in the cabins of this wild continent. Libraries under rude roofs exhibited the classic treasures of Greece, and Rome, and Britain. Homer and Demosthenes were studied in chimney-corners by the blaze of winter logs. Cicero and Virgil were read where the oration in the Capitol, or the description of burning Troy might be interrupted by the bound of the deer, or the yell of the savage. Shakspeare and Milton were recited beneath the shadows of trees which had for centuries stood amid the silence of the primeval forests. The sons of wealthy colonists often brought from the halls of universities and the drawing-rooms of London the discipline and the manners of the most refined society. Yet such were the struggles of life in subduing this young world from the wildness of nature and the dominion of the Indian, that there was little opportunity or incentive for poetic creation. You perceive in essays, sermons, addresses, histories, biographies, verses, the traces of a painful imitation. It is a remarkable fact that in the early productions of this infant people there were more evidences of mature culture than native vigor. The works of Divines before the revolution, and Statesmen after the revolution, are

often characterized by as much elegance of style, and refinement of thought as those of the parent country. Our state of colonial vassalage is stamped on the entire literature of the period. Never did men become more bold and original in what pertained to war and government, and never were men more tame and imitative in what pertained to style and manners. Usually the development in letters is from excessive vigor to excessive culture. In our own country the law has almost been reversed. Had not the Revolution severed us from dependence on England, we would have displayed no more creative talent in the department of Poetry than is promoted by Canada or Australia. The genius of song was weighed down by the magnitude of its treasures inherited from the whole past of the world. The struggles which gave us freedom, and the difficulties conquered in establishing our marvelous constitution soon gave fire and originality to the national mind. The vivid, and delicate, and versatile Irving afforded the first decided tokens of high literary gifts, and although his fancies were expressed in prose, he was really our pioneer in Poetry. Bryant and Longfellow, by success in their respective spheres have demonstrated that the Muse in our Republic will rule sovereign in her own domain, and eventually win in this Western world a crown brilliant with native beauty, whose lustre will rival the glory of the Orient. And there is certainly every reason to believe that the period of poetic vigor will be greatly prolonged. There is indeed much that is practical and prosaic to extinguish the fire of originating genius. The material conquests of steam, and electricity are not favorable to sensibility and fancy. The exactitudes of science restrain the flights of the imagination. The artificial demands of society may too often convert the gifted genius into the drudging slave. The increasing bribery and corruption, and selfishness of our age are blighting like a pestilence. Yet, on the other hand, the day of our senility is evidently far distant. Our Republic glows with all the hope of youth. A vast territory excites boundless aspirations. Varied scenery furnishes fancy with the most diversified images. Commercial, and social, and political connection with all the nations of the world imparts largeness to our views, and not only preserves from stagnation, but is a perpetual source of vivacity and inspiration. Our language, too vigorous to lose its own idiosyncrasy, will be enriched from the vocabularies

of the world. Besides, what infinite variety will be contributed by this fusion of thought inevitable amid the representatives of so many commingling nations! What a wealth of imagery and association is constantly imported from the literature, the philosophy, the mythology, the history, the art, the manners, the customs of immigrants who crowd our shores from almost every region of Africa, and Asia, and Europe! Such contacts are sufficient to produce the perennial freshness of youth. That American aspiration too, often indeed exaggerated, and grotesque, and disgusting, which would conform to our constitution all the governments of the world, and on the ruins of thrones erect a universal Republic, will forever stimulate American energy, and animate American intellect. Our territory also is so vast that the corrupt, and artificial life of cities can never enervate as in the smaller countries of Europe, where the vices of the Capital infect the most distant regions of the Kingdom. No period can arise in our history when genius cannot be educated amid the repose and purity of varied scenes of natural beauty and sublimity, while the universal diffusion of education may give an equal advantage to the Poet who sings amid the grandeur of the Rocky Mountains, and to the Poet who touches his lyre where the sail-covered Hudson mingles with the sea. Considering then the inspiration of our history, the achievements of our past, the vastness of our territory, the richness of our language, the varieties of our population, the charms of our scenery, the nobility of our mission, the largeness of our aspiration, we may predict in the future a wealth of national Poetry, which will be marked by the highest creative power, and correspond to the endowments of our national genius, and the glory of our national destiny.

Perhaps we may not be deemed tedious if we conclude our Article with another suggestion. The heroism of Grecian history, and the imagery of Grecian mythology could not so perpetuate the inspiration of Homer, as to make his second Epic glow with the charms and burn with the ardors of the first. The Iliad resembles the lyre of Apollo struck amid meridian brilliance. The Odyssey suggests a feebler note sounding from the god, as day's dying glory sank into the sea. On the contrary Milton's earlier songs give little promise of his subsequent greatness. Often they are insufferably and freezingly classical. They indeed exhibit a mar-

velous wealth of imagination. Yet even the L' Allegro and Il' Penseroso, filled with all images of joy and melancholy, and tuneful as a harp of heaven, seem rather the results of studied art, than the outbursts of a resistless inspiration. But suddenly we perceive in the "Paradise Lost" visions of unequaled sublimity and majesty. The Poet seems transported into a higher world. His blindness becomes his illumination. But why are the fires of his age brighter than those of his youth? It is because his theme, drawn from his Religion, wide as the universe, and great as eternity, stirs in him thoughts pure, and bright, and vast like those which kindle angels. No heathen mythology could ever have poured such brilliance over his darkness. Christianity was his inspiration. Here was the secret of his fervor, his largeness, his glory. And thus as we expect our Holy Religion will preserve in our Republic that life which perished amid the corruptions of idolatrous empires, so we may hope that in the latter days of its diffusion and triumph, it will illuminate and transfigure our national Poetry, until our millenial song shall evince the noblest achievement of human genius, and distant centuries, perpetually youthful, shine with the crowning brightness of our world.

Art. II.—THE ETHICAL PHILOSOPHY OF PLATO.

The Ethics of Plato are not merely an incidental accompaniment of his Philosophy, or even a subordinate department of it, but the real aim and inspiration of his whole system.

Whatever be the subject he may have in hand, whether the individual man, the state, or the physical creation, it is always presented from some point of view depending on its ethical relations. His Ontology, Theology, Psychology, Cosmogony and Politics are every where regarded as deriving their chief importance from their connection with the moral nature of man, and the use which can be made of them in giving him right conceptions of virtue, and leading him to the love and practice of a life of virtue.

This is, in fact, the atmosphere in which all his thinking "lives and moves and has its being;" it gives the spirit in which every question is to be approached, and with reference to which it is to be

decided; and even in many of the dialogues where it is not de[illegible]finitely named, it so pervades and shapes all the discussion, that on[illegible]ly in the ethical connection of his system can we find the key [illegible]y which to understand their meaning, or explain their form.

We may convey a partial idea of this pre-eminence of the ethica[illegible]l in the Philosophy of Plato, by citing some of the almost innume[illegible]-able expressions in which he asserts his convictions of the par[illegible]-mount necessity, and excellence of virtue.

"The whole of our laws ought always to look to one point, and this ma[illegible] be correctly called virtue." v. 536. "The good rhetorician addresses the a[illegible]guments he uses, and all his actions to souls, directing his attention to thi[illegible], that every virtue may be planted in them, but vice driven out." i. 207. "When any one honors beauty before virtue this is truly and wholly a dis[illegible] honor to the soul." v. 154. "Virtue is a kind of health, beauty and goo[illegible] habit of the soul, and vice its disease, deformity and infirmity." ii. 130. "All things should be done for the sake of what is good." i. 201. "O y[illegible] Gods grant me to become beautiful in the inner man." i. 360. "So lon[illegible] as the soul is depraved, as being without understanding, intemperate, unjust[illegible], and unholy, one ought to restrain it from the indulgence of its desires, and[illegible] not permit it to do anything except what will render it better." i. 207. "It is no advantage to confer any benefit upon the city or the citizens un[illegible]less the mind of those who are about to receive either great riches or domin[illegible]ion or any other power be upright and good." i. 217. "If you would man[illegible]age the affairs of a State rightly, and well, you must impart to the citizens[illegible] virtue, and you must therefore in the first place, acquire virtue yourself." iv. 369. "States, then, are not in want of walls, or ships, or docks, if they would be happy, nor even of a multitude of people, or extent of country, without the possession of virtue." iv. 368. "The most base of all evils is injustice, in a word, the depravity of the soul." i. 173. "And depravity of the soul is the most base of all because it exceeds all the others by some extraordinarily great harm and wonderful evil." i. 174. "The greatest of all the punishments for evil conduct is the becoming similar to bad men." v. 155. "And to go to Hades with a soul full of crimes is the worst of evils." i. 227.

These, and many other like passages testify, unmistakably, to the high place which Ethics held in the mind of Plato, and no man has ever announced this in more varied and unquestionable terms. And what is thus expressed in definite assertions, is also abundantly illustrated in the arguments, or implied conclusions of many of the Dialogues. In Gorgias he contends that the essential question about everything men seek to be or do, is, whether it will make the man more pure in soul and better in his life. The theory of Protagoras is tested by its relation to the acquirement of a virtu-

ous character. Philœbus is a demonstration that pleasure is nothing but an evil, and a curse, if separated from the good. Phædrus, in its glowing pictures, represents the true aim of the soul as the desire to live in contemplation of the perfections of the Deity. The Republic enters upon the study of good and evil in the State, that by a knowledge of them on this larger scale, we may the more easily learn their nature in the individual. In the first Alcibiades he leads that brilliant but ill-regulated young Athenian to the confession, that any attempt at true statesmanship without a knowledge of the best, and a life of virtue, is an absurdity, and the *second* Alcibiades shows that a man is not able even to pray rightly unto God unless he have "a knowledge of the best," by which alone he can know how he ought to live, and what to ask for.

And so in various lines of thought, the themes of many others of the Dialogues are either questions involving the fundamental principles of Ethics, or inquiries into the relation and application of these to different spheres of actual life, or the correction of erroneous modes of thinking. But conclusive as this constant reference to virtue is as to the importance that Plato attached to it in all his reasoning and teaching, we cannot gain from even this an adequate conception of the true relations of the ethical to the essential idea of his Philosophy. These we can rightly understand only when we have first comprehended this essential idea, and traced out its connection with the spirit and structure of his entire system, for it is in the fundamental principles which underlie and pervade his Philosophy as a whole, that we learn its vital relation to Ethics, far more than any, or all the specific dicta he has pronounced about virtue in general, or any of the questions connected with the conduct of life: and, indeed, all these are only necessary inferences from the essential conceptions of his system, and lose their full meaning, and profoundest significance, if not understood in their relations to this system.

But though there is thus, as we think, such a close and indissoluble connection between his Ethics and the constructive ideas of his Philosophy, that this Philosophy is, in fact, all one great scheme of Ethics, yet this is made comparatively much less prominent by most of his commentators than it deserves; indeed some of them seem almost to deny that he had any definite, and consistent

thought, thus binding his Philosophy into a coherent system, and hence make no attempt to represent its various elements in living unity as parts of a symmetrical and profoundly elaborated whole: and thus both miss the real purpose of many of the discussions, and fail to apprehend the mind of Plato in that sublime conception of Philosophy which is his distinctive and unrivalled excellence.

It is indeed true that he has nowhere presented his system as a whole, and in one view, either from its ethical aim, or its ontological assumptions. It is given in no one dialogue, nor in any definitely related series of them; and it is only by studying closely, and in connection, the whole body of his writings, that we can be in a position to trace out his entire scheme of thought; for every discussion—even those the most seemingly inconclusive—contributes something towards its full comprehension; some doing this by direct assertion, or implied inference from his fundamental truths, and others by distinctive criticism on some opposing error.

And on the other hand, while his theory is nowhere definitely elaborated, it, yet so underlies all that he says, and everything he discusses, that much which he has written is almost wholly unintelligible without reference to it, and when once clearly apprehended, it will be found so to pervade every portion of his writings that it gives them all one tone and character, as the melody of a tune runs through, and gives its spirit to every part of its most elaborate and seemingly unconnected variations.

The starting point for a clear apprehension of Plato's Philosophy, and its relation to Ethics, is a correct understanding of his conception of KNOWLEDGE, or SCIENCE, and the CONNECTION OF KNOWLEDGE WITH VIRTUE. Whatever virtue may be, it is in his mind, so connected with knowledge or science, that *whoever has not true science* or *knowledge* has *not virtue*, and the *soul which does have true knowledge*, or *science*, *cannot but be possessed* of virtue.

"True virtue subsists with wisdom, whether pleasures, and fears, and everything else of the kind is present or absent; but when separated from wisdom, consider whether such virtue is not a mere outline, and in reality servile, possessing neither soundness nor truth." i. 68. "Wisdom is the virtue of the soul." iv. 366. "The sensible and just are such as *know* what is meet to do, and say both towards gods and men." iv. 396. "Virtue appears to be altogether knowledge." i. 293.

And what is thus directly stated, is also evidenced in the general tenor of the thought and argument in quite a number of the Dialogues, in which, although the proposition is not definitely stated, the manifest conclusion is, that true knowledge is so essential to all right living, and correct thinking that neither of them is possible without the others; and conversely that he who really has attained to either, must necessarily be possessor of them all.

Of the fact and importance of this connection in the mind of Plato there is no question, but to understand its nature, and the relation it has to the ethical character of his Philosophy, we must apprehend clearly, and always hold fast the notion which he had of knowledge, and the position he assigned it in the soul of man.

This differs very widely from the conception we now have of knowledge: and this difference concerned both, I. the MATERIAL of KNOWLEDGE, and II. THE MENTAL RELATION WHICH CONSTITUTES KNOWING.

I. With us, knowledge is an acquaintance with any sort of facts or opinions; and science is the reduction of our knowledge on any subject to the general principles by which its facts are united into a system. But with Plato, knowledge or science was only possible of things which have a real and enduring truth and being, of essential and unchangeable existence and verities. If things have no essential being, no abiding certainty which makes them always the same, and always true, we cannot predicate any actual knowledge of them; for just as we think to grasp them, they are changed or vanished. Real knowledge must deal with realities eternal and essential, universal and necessary: nothing else can properly be called knowledge.

"What really is, may be known; and the nature of science is to regard that which exists, and to know what existence is." ii. 165. "The true lover of learning is naturally inclined to aspire after the knowledge of real being, and when he approaches thus far and mingles therewith, thus giving rise to intellect and truth, he will attain to true knowledge." ii. 176. "Those who contemplate many beautiful things, but never perceive beauty itself, and many just things, though not justice itself, and all other things in like manner, they have no accurate knowledge." ii. 176. "When the soul examines anything by itself, and approaches to that which is pure, eternal, immortal and unchangeable, and, as being allied to it continues constantly with it, this affection of the soul is called wisdom." i. 182."

But where shall the soul find these unchanging verities? Where is this true being, this essentially real?

The only things in which Plato recognizes these qualities, are those which are inherent in the nature, or express the unchangeable thoughts or attributes of the one only true being, which is the divine soul, the supreme, all-perfect, unalterable God;—and this is so, because the essential nature of the Divine existence is such that it embraces in itself everything that is real, true, and good, and perfect; and hence whatever has reality, or truth, or goodness, must have its being in him, or be the expression of something derived from him.

The general characteristics of this perfect existence are stated thus:

"We shall not easily be persuaded that motion, life, soul and prudence are not truly present to that which is existing in perfection, and that it neither lives, nor thinks, but stands immovable not possessing intellect, as an object of respect and holy." iii. 153.

And what is here referred to as "Existing in perfection," is elsewhere identified with the supreme, unchanging intellect of the universe—the artificer of all that is produced—the essential, though incomprehensible source and communicator of all good, the governor and Lord of men, and when spoken of by name or title, is called "The Deity" or "God," and this deity is not merely one of the mythological divinities, but is called "God," in the sense to which Cudworth refers, (Vol. i. p. 429,) when he says "ὁ θεὸς and θεὸς are often taken by the Greeks not for θεῶν τις "a god," or "one of the gods," but for "God or the Supreme Deity," "the one archetypal mind, the demiurge or maker of all things that are produced." Nor is it to be understood as only a name standing for a bare ontological abstraction without personality and will, or a blind plastic law of nature, working by some necessary and inherent principle of development towards inevitable but unforeseen results, but he is an all-powerful reasoning intellect, acting upon known rational and moral attributes, with conscious purpose, and for the highest good of all his universe.

We cannot, it is true, penetrate into his essential Being; for,

"To discover the Creator and Father of this Universe, as well as His work is difficult, and when discovered, it is impossible to reveal Him to mankind at large." v. 332.

But we may know sufficient of His attributes and works to understand the nature of His connection with the Universe, and ourselves.

"Whatever is generated has a cause, and this Universe as being generated must have a cause, and this was an Artificer, who made it according to an eternal and beautiful pattern." ii. 332. "The cause of all things is Soul, which is the most ancient of all things, and the commencement of motion, and leads everything in Heaven, and on Earth, and in the Sea, by its movements, the names of which are to will, to consider, to take care of, to consult, to form opinions, true and false, to be in a state of joy, sorrow, confidence, fear, hate, and love," v. 426; but "a beginning is uncreated, and hence the beginning of motion is uncreated, neither can it perish; and this is the essence of Soul, to be both uncreated and immortal," i. 321, "and the genus of Soul intellectual and full of virtue, has a power over Heaven, and Earth, and the most excellent Soul takes care of the whole world, and leads it along a Path" (v. 427,) "for Mind is the King of Heaven and Earth; and a certain wonderful Intellect disposes all things in order, arranges things together, and governs throughout." (iv. 38.) "And as regards the King of All, all things are His, and for His sake, and He is the Cause of all that is beautiful." (iv. 482.) "The world was created through the Providence of the Deity," ii. 334, "and the Universe was produced after the intelligence of the eternal Deity had conceived its form," ii. 337, "and He made everything which springs from the Earth, and all sorts of animals, and also the earth, the heaven, the gods, and all things in heaven, and in Hades under the Earth." ii. 285.

From Him were generated all the Visible and Inferior gods, and He addresses them as

"Gods which are the progeny of Gods, of whom I am the Creator and Father."

And certain parts of the Creation, and care of the world are given to their charge, but only as the responsible and delegated agents of the Potential Author, the Supreme Deity.

"For the Creator, Himself, being the Artificer of Divine Natures, committed to His offspring (the Junior gods) the charge of producing those that are mortal," ii. 380; "and after arranging these particulars, He retired to his accustomed State, and His Sons obeyed their Father's order." ii. 347.

So that while the immediate guidance of the world is entrusted to the lower gods, its real care and government are maintained by the One essential Deity;

"For it is God who takes care of us, and we are His property," i. 60. "And by Him who takes care of the Universe with a view to the safety and excellence of the whole, everything has been arranged, each part of which, as far as possible, suffers, and acts what is suited to it." v. 440.

And this framing Artificer and All-Controlling Deity is good.

"For God is good essentially, and the cause of all those things which are in a right state," ii. 60; "And He desired that all things should, as much as possible, resemble Himself, and that as far as possible all things should be good." ii. 334.

What the Good is in itself, is too high for present inquiry; but we may grasp something of its results, what He calls its Offspring—for

"In the subjects of human knowledge the Idea of the Good is the last object of vision, and hard to be seen: and when beheld, it must be inferred from reason to be the cause of what is right and beautiful in all things." ii. 202. "Higher than Justice and other virtues, is 'the Idea of the Good,' the highest branch of study; about which, when Justice and the other virtues employ themselves, they then become useful and advantageous; and without this knowledge, though we were to understand everything else as fully as possible, yet it could be of no service," ii. 193; because "That which imparts truth to what is known, and dispenses the faculty of knowledge to Him who knows, you may call 'the Idea of the Good,' and the principle of Science and truth; and as both knowledge and truth are so beautiful, you are right to think that 'the Good' is something still more beautiful and different from these; and as Sight and Light are both Sun-like, yet we do not think them to be the Sun, so Science and Truth, both of them partake of the nature of the Good, yet we have no right to suppose that either of them is the Good, inasmuch as the Good itself is worthy of still greater honor; for things cognizable by the Intellect, become cognizable not only from the Good by which they are known; but, likewise, their being and essence are thence derived, while the Good itself is not essence, but beyond essence, and superior to both in dignity and power." ii. 198.

Such a conception of the Good necessitates the admission of Grote (1 Grote's Plato, iii., 25,) that

"Good, in the mind of Plato, is associated exclusively with rational agency; it can be produced only by a Reason, or by some Personal Agent, analogous to a reasonable, intelligent man."

And as the good of all the Universe is from the One Idea and all things were created after the Same One Pattern,

"There are not some two Deities;" but "One archetypal mind, the Paradigm of all created things." ii. 335. And this "Deity is the same in every respect forever," iii. 544, for "God is quite simple and true, both in word and deed. Neither is He changed Himself, nor does He deceive others." ii. 64.

Such being the nature of the One Only real Being, His thoughts and attributes express themselves in certain "Intellectual Forms,"

which are essentially true, good, and unchangeable, because they are of and from His Essence; and these Intellectual Forms of the Divine Existence, Plato calls IDEAS. As Alcinous says:

"The Deity has thoughts, and since the Primary Mind is the most beautiful of things, it would be forever thinking on itself and its own cogitations, and this, its mental energy, is Idea, for Ideas are the notions of God, eternal and perfect in themselves." vi. 262–264.

Now it was after these eternal expressions of His own nature and cogitations that God framed the Universe.

"He looked on them as an eternal pattern," ii. 333, as "A species of model, apprehensible by the Intellect, and always the same, and the Universe is an imitation of the model, generated and visible." ii. 354. "And is framed by impressing it with forms corresponding to the nature of its pattern." ii. 343. "Hence, we must lay down some one Idea respecting everything, and on every occasion seek for it." iv. 15. "In the same manner," says Alcinous, "As from one Seal there are many impressions," so we "Suppose a certain Idea relating to many individuals to which we give the same name." ii. 285.

And this is true, both of the attributes of the soul, and of material things. There is for each a Form or Idea in the Divine mind, after which it was framed, and which it should as far as possible resemble: and these Ideas as being the eternal Forms of the Divine thought, are not concrete, and separate existences, to be perceived apart from their essential being in the Divine mind, but thoughts and attributes of God, which are

"To be apprehended only by the Intellect, and not perceptible by the senses." ii. 358. Hence, "There is a certain abstract beauty, and goodness, and magnitude, and so of all the others." i. 166. "And these things, which continue forever the same, you cannot apprehend in any other way than by thought; for such things are invisible, and are not seen." i. 81. "Hence, if anything is beautiful, nothing causes it to be beautiful, except the presence or communication of that abstract beauty; and I say the same of everything." i. 107. "For while there are many beautiful things, there is only one Beautiful, one Just, and so of the rest." ii. 166.

And so also of the Material things, Grote says, (1 Grote's Plato, iii., 267.)

"We must assume the Forms or Ideas of Fire, Air, Earth, Water, &c., as distinct and self-existent, eternal, indestructible, unchangeable; neither visible nor tangible; but apprehended by Reason or Intellect."

It is to these *Ideas* we are referred by Plato as the *only valid material of real knowledge.* They are entities, existing in and from the Divine; and there is no true existence, entity, τὸ ὄν, but in these Divine expressions of its own nature and thought. They are not concrete, sensible individualities; but the attributes and archetypal thoughts of the Divine soul, which have an essential being and reality in the Divine Intellect, as modi of its existence; we may, perhaps, best liken them to the mode in which the feelings and Images of our dreams—(if these were actual expressions of our nature, and remained, as fixed, unchanging conditions of our thought)—have their existence in our mind. What we thus see and feel, have their existence only in and from the mind, and can be perceived only by the Intellect; but at the same time they have a kind of being and reality which makes them actual existences; and of such a nature, that they are both wholly in the mind, and yet in some sense distinct from it; and if another mind, by Mental Intuition, could perceive and thus participate in them, we should in this have an analogy, rude perhaps, and yet approximate to the relation which Plato conceived between the human Intellect and the Divine Ideas. But these Ideas are not mere inert concepts, or inoperative thoughts, they are the models after which the Deity is always *striving* to mould and organize the Material Universe, and the qualities impressed upon man's moral nature in its origin, which all men should endeavor to discern and realize. And, hence, if we are really to *know* anything about the true nature of either the Physical Creation, or the moral qualities of man, it must be by a knowledge of the Divine reality, Idea, which is the pattern they were intended to resemble, and the test by which they must be tried. Whatever thinking is not based on this, is only opinion; it may be true opinion, or false opinion, but it is not knowledge; for this cannot be where there is not the expression of unchanging reality and truth for its material. Whoever does not know what God intended anything to be, cannot, in fact, know what its real nature is; whoever does not realize what God thinks about the Good, the Just, the Beautiful, in itself cannot judge anything with certainty about the goodness, justice, beauty, or any other moral quality of man's Character or Life.

The Soul to have true knowledge, must, therefore, have been in direct communication with these Divine Conceptions and Exem-

plars; must have had spiritual vision of them; and as this cannot be in our present state, because the Intellect is blinded, and marred by its imprisonment in the body, Plato assumes that the Soul had an existence in the region of Pure Intellect before it fell into the lower world, and was united to the body; and in this previous existence it had an intuition, a mental Sight of the Divine Ideas; and in this beatific vision saw for itself those perfect and unchanging Images of what was indeed essential, because Divine reality and truth. This is expressed very beautifully in a sort of allegory in the Phœdrus.

"In the lofty regions where the race of the gods dwell, the Mighty Chief in Heaven, Zeus, goes first, driving a winged chariot, ordering and taking care of all things; and there follows him a host of gods and demons; but there are many delightful sights, and paths within the heavens, among which the blessed gods move; and whoso has both will, and power, accompanies them; for envy stands aloof from the Heavenly Choir; and during this circuit the soul beholds Justice herself, it beholds Science, it beholds Temperance; not that to which Creation is annexed, but that which is Science, in what really is; and when it sees that which really is, it is delighted; and by contemplating, the Truth is nourished, and thrives; and every soul of man has, from its very nature, seen true existences: but the Essence which really exists, colorless, formless and intangible, is visible only to Intelligence; and around Essence is the place of true Science."

And hence, as such are the only objects and conditions upon which true knowledge is possible; there can be no proper science based on the mere perceptions of the senses, or the conventional opinions about life and conduct: for these are in their very nature changing, imperfect, and without essential existence in themselves; and, therefore, they are considered by Plato as "non-entities"—τὰ μὴ ὄντα: not that they literally "are not;" but that they have only a transient, phenomenal relation to us, and not essential, inherent verity and being; and hence, we can neither predicate knowledge of them, nor have any certain, valid science from them: so that in the Platonic sense, *true* KNOWLEDGE *is to be* SOUGHT and FOUND, SOLELY in the IDEAS, *that is the* THOUGHTS, CONCEPTIONS and ATTRIBUTES of the DIVINE BEING, GOD.

II. As Plato's conception of knowledge thus binds it, for its material, to the realities and truths of the divine nature and thought, and in this differs very widely from our notion of it, so does his view of the MENTAL RELATION which CONSTITUTES KNOW-

ING differ radically from that which is now current. With us knowledge of anything is mere acquaintance with, or memory of it; but Plato means by knowledge, such a possession of the thing known as makes it an essential part of our own experience, character and life; and, hence, will make us to be such as the nature of the thing known requires we should be. We sometimes use the word in the same manner, as e. g., when we say "a man who knows music is a musician," or "he who knows the art of painting is a painter." So that in general, knowledge is with Plato such that

"He who has learnt any art, is such a person as each science respectively makes its proficient; and he who has learnt just things is just." i. 152.

Or as more fully expressed in some verses of Epicharmus quoted by Diogenes Laertius, vi. 183.

"Seems not the case then, to be thus about the good?
That of itself it is a thing, and he who learning, knows it, good becomes?
Just as a piper who has learned to pipe;
Or to dance, has a dancer learned;
Or some weaver to weave;
Or what you will of trades like these."

And in another aspect, Plato says of it,

"Knowledge is, as if one had gone a certain road and thus knew it; while opinion is only as if one had heard of it from others." iii. 43.

Thus real knowledge is, with Plato, not only an acquaintance with facts about the eternal realities, and truths, but such a spiritual intuition and participation of these divine ideas as shall make them essential powers in our own experience, and life; it is in fact the same as the Bible means by knowing, in such passages among many others, as (Jno. xvii. 3.)

"This is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" And of which Delitzsch (Job, v. 2, p. 31) says correctly, "γινωσκειν signifies mostly in the Bible a knowledge which enters into the subject intimately and unites itself with it." So that in Plato's view, "Knowledge in its highest conception has the good for its object and contents." (*Bunsen's God in History*, ii. 333.) "And is not attained until the mind is brought into clear view of the universal ideas or forms, and intimate communion with them." (*Grote's Plato*, i. 267.) And therefore he can truly say of knowledge in this sense, "It is a noble thing, and able to govern man; and if a man know good and evil, he can never be overcome by anything, so as to do anything else than what knowledge bids him." i. 283

ıe relation between knowledge thus conceived, and virtue, is ily apparent. They are in fact the same, only regarded in ;what different aspects. Knowledge is the presence and ;r of the divine ideas in the soul, instructing and moulding it the likeness of themselves; and virtue is the character de- l from these same ideas, and outwardly expressed in corres- ling life and acts. Now, knowledge is in the whole Philosophy lato, the one absolutely essential thing which every life should ;, and from which alone we can derive true principles of rea- ng and living. This is asserted and maintained directly, in many of his discussions; and is the key to the understanding ıe drift of nearly all the so-called Negative Dialogues, or those hich no definite conclusion is announced: the most of these ; some important element of life, or thought, and show by a ıctio ad absurdum, the impossibility of gaining any satisfactory ılts concerning it, apart from the relations it should hold to wledge; and thus they are designed to demonstrate the inabil- to think or do anything aright without true science; and in view, the highest and only proper aim of every soul should be, ıave this knowledge. He only who does this has any right ;eption of what life is, or how to use it. The science which this for its subject, is alone true science; and to reason discourse of dialectics, which is the name he gives this ıce, is the only theme worthy the thought and study of the philosopher. And when we conceive of knowledge in the e of Plato, we see at once that virtue, Ethics in its most pro- ıd conception, is the essential and pervading spirit of his en- Philosophy. Its fundamental principle is, that the realities truths of the Divine Nature should be the constant object of thoughts, and the controlling power of the soul; and to lead to a life of virtue is the inspiring aim it everywhere pro- s.

o make men know God, and seek to be like Him—this, then, is vital principle of the Philosophy of Plato, and this is the sub- ideal he presents as the only proper end of every human When it has this it has true knowledge; and this is virtue; alize this is the highest object of all true Philosophy, and to it should be the constant effort of the life of every man.

"For he who is employed in knowledge, and true wisdom should be endued with wisdom about immortal and divine concerns; for we are plants not of earth but heaven; and from the same source whence our souls arose, a divine nature raising aloft our head and root, directs our whole corporeal frame." ii. 406. "By looking at what is divine and bright, we shall do what is pleasing to the Deity, and know what is our own good." iv. 369. "And we should endeavor as quickly as possible to fly to the gods; and this flight consists in resembling God as much as possible; and this resemblance is the becoming just and holy with wisdom; and on this depends the true excellence of a man, and his nothingness and worthlessness." ii. 411. "The man is dear to the Deity, who is similar to Him." v. 140. "And if the company will be persuaded by me, we considering the soul to be immortal and able to bear all evil and good, shall always persevere in the road that leads upward; that so we may be friends both to ourselves, and to the gods." ii. 312. "For the best mode of life is to live and die in the exercise of justice, and the other virtues; and we should be anxious not about living, but about living well; and study not to appear good, but to be so." i. 281. "For no possession whatever would be of aught avail without the possession of the good." ii. 193. "And one who has adorned his soul, not with a foreign, but its own proper ornament, temperance, justice, fortitude and truth, may be confident about his soul." i. 124. "For he is beloved of the gods, and if he happen to be in poverty, or diseases, or any other seeming evils, these issue in something good, either while alive or dead, for never is he at any time neglected by the gods, who inclines earnestly to become just, and practice virtue so far as it is possible for man to resemble God." ii. 303.

Such are the fundamental principles of Plato's conception of the nature and source of virtue; but there are also several conclusions derived from these, which are essential to the notion of virtue as conceived by him.

One of these is the seeming paradox, to which he often recurs, that although virtue is knowledge, yet it cannot be taught; it is knowledge because consisting in the intuition and participation of the Divine idea; but as this is something which concerns exclusively our own personal experience, it cannot be communicated to us by any human teacher; the traces of these ideas, impressed on our soul in its pre-existence, are, it is true, in every man, but they have been so obscured by the passions of the body, and the perversions of the soul, that they are almost obliterated; and the most that the best human teaching, true Philosophy, can effect, is to arouse the mind to enter on the search for these Divine realities, and aid it to recall them to itself again in purity and in power. But even to do this aright, requires a higher agency than any un-

assisted human influence: virtue is so divine a thing that it can come to man only as a gift of God.

"And is present to those to whom it is present, not by nature, nor by being taught, but by a Divine destiny." iv. 48.

And it is from this characteristic of it that Justin Martyr says* "that Plato has announced the Holy Ghost under the name of virtue." He also connects with the Holy Spirit another of the conclusions of Plato respecting virtue, viz: "that there are not several virtues, which can exist separately, and be practiced independently one of the other, but only one virtue, which is the endeavor of the soul to look upon God,"† and shape the life into His likeness; and what we call different virtues, Temperance, Prudence, Fortitude and Justice, are only various manifestations of the one same Divine Image in our soul; and as says Justin‡ "the one same Holy Spirit is divided into seven spirits, so he also naming it one and the same virtue divides it into four virtues." A man, to have true virtue, must strive in all things to "be perfect even as his Father in the Heaven is perfect;" and whoso "shall offend in one is guilty of all."

Nor is it this life alone with which virtue, in Plato's conception, is involved.

"The soul is the man," iv. 361, "and is immortal; and as immortal it requires our care, not only for the present time, which we call life, but for all time; and the danger would appear to be dreadful if one should neglect it; for if death were a deliverance from everything, it would be a great gain for the wicked when they die, to be delivered at the same time from the body and from their vices, with the soul; but now since it appears to be immortal, it can have no other refuge from evils, nor safety, except by becoming as good, and wise as possible." i. 116. "For when soul and body are separated by death, each possesses much the same habit that the man had when alive and the soul manifests as well its natural disposition, as the affections which the man acquired in his soul from his various pursuits." i. 229. "And there are two models in the nature of things, one Divine, and most happy, and the other ungodly and most miserable, and bad men, through stupidity and extreme folly, become similar to the one by unjust actions, and dissimilar to the other, wherefore they are punished by leading a life suited to that to which they are assimilated." i. 412. "Every one shall partake of virtue, more or less, according as he honors or dishonors her, and the cause is in

* Ante Nicene Library, ii. 320.

† Justin Martyr, ii. 88.

‡ Ante Nicene Library, ii. 320.

him who makes the choice, and the Deity is blameless." ii. 308. "And man who has passed through life justly and piously, when he dies shall g to the Isles of the Blest and dwell in all perfect happiness, free from evi but he who has lived unjustly and impiously shall go to a prison of punishmen and justice which they call Tartarus." i. 228. "There, then, it seems, the whole danger of man; and hence, this is of all things, most to be attende to. How each of us, omitting other studies, is to become a learner and inquire in this study, in order to be able to discern a good life and a bad, and t choose everywhere and at all times, the best of what is possible; for we hav seen that in life and in death, this is the best choice." ii. 309.

We have now traced, though only in bare skeleton, the outlin of the thoughts of Plato about virtue, God, man's place in this uni verse, and the meaning and destiny of the life of man. Have, i a word, sketched the main features of his Philosophy, viewed i its ethical relations; and from these, we have seen, not only tha he announced important principles and lofty precepts in the do main of Ethics, but also that his entire system of Philosophy wa everywhere so interwoven with the ethical, and dependent on it that this must be regarded as the essential and constructive elemen of his whole scheme of thought. And our end will be attained i we have conveyed with truth, and some degree of clearness, an ide of this, the most wonderful of all the products of the human intel lect. We have not space, nor did it consist with our purpose t enter into the details of his opinions on the minor questions o state organization, or individual actions; in these we should fin many things which the superior morality we have derived from Re velation would condemn as flaws and errors; and much that i vague and unsatisfactory; for while he everywhere abounds wit the profoundest truths and wisest maxims, upon almost every sub ject in the range of human life, at the same time his views o what is practically right or wrong in special acts, or lines o conduct are often wide astray from our better standard. Thoug he yearned to know God, he had but an imperfect sense of wh God's moral and spiritual nature truly is; and he rather was a ma who sought to apprehend the Divine goodness, and perfections, th one who really knew them as they were; and yet, in the concl sions of his Dialectics, he has laid the foundation of a Philosoph of Ethics, which stands hard by the truths of Revelation; and i essential principle, that the grand aim of life should be so to kno God, the good, the true, the just, the beautiful as to be like Him, i a conception so sublime and godlike, that it fully justifies the ve dict of the ages which has pronounced its author the Divine Plato

Art. III.—BISHOP TEMPLE.

ssays and Reviews. Twelfth edition, 12mo. London, Longmans.

eplies to Essays and Reviews. New York. D. Appleton & Co., 1862.

ds to Faith. By various writers. London. Murray, 1863.

eplanation of the Bishop of Exeter, before the Convocation of Canterbury, 1870.

THE singular elevation of Mr. Gladstone is teaching some remarkle lessons in regard to Church and State in Great Britain. As Israeli attained the Premiership by advocating an extension of franchise, so his successor reached office on the proposed ruin the Irish establishment. We thus perceive that two men—the e conservative by birth, and education, and the other conservaeby conviction, and interest—have inaugurated an ecclesiastical, d a political revolution which may eventually make England a rtual republic. And equally strange was the appointment of r. Temple to the See of Exeter. We might have supposed that e instincts of Mr. Gladstone as a Churchman would have conolled his policy as a Statesman. Far otherwise. His career ems a display of contrarieties. He could scarcely have ade a nomination more unexpected, more in opposition to s former views, or more distasteful to the two great sections the English Church. The election, and consecration of Dr. emple despite the indignation of Laymen, the resolutions of lergymen, and the protests of Bishops was a signal triumph of ationalism. Amid the solemnities of the service in the venerable hurch which saw him invested with the sanctities of the Episcopal rder, and admitted into the Apostolical Succession, an American nitarian, witnessed with exultation the imposing rite, felt he had part in the ceremonial, and afterwards described the scene with owing words which over our own country kindled triumph in the arts of thousands who deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, and e Divinity of our Lord. An event so striking certainly demands me notice in our pages. Nor has its interest been diminished by e singular explanation of the new Bishop in the Convocation of nterbury. On one day, his august brethren in the Episcopate ar with inexpressible relief that the objectionable Essay will

never again be published by its author. Joy is expressed. Congratulations are exchanged. Confidence is restored. The news flashes over two continents. On the next day a reason is assigned for the determination so unexpectedly announced which not only nullifies its force, but aggravates, and intensifies the original offence. Previously Dr. Temple avowed that he was not responsible for the opinions of his associates. Now he declares that the objectionable volume, directed against the most venerable mysteries of the Faith as revealed in the inspired Scriptures, embodied in the Ancient Creeds, expressed in the English Offices, while it mischievously shook the confidence of many Christians in different parts of the world, and encouraged the efforts of sceptics, yet accomplished more good than evil, and that although a Bishop of Exeter should not make alliance with Rationalism, still a Doctor of Divinity, having a different position, and therefore a different conscience, and a different responsibility, might march under the banners of the common enemy.

Before examining the most dangerous position of the celebrated Essay, it may be well to revive our fading recollections of what was advanced in the volume which it introduced. The Review of Bunsen, by Dr. Williams betrays an evident desire to extenuate i not defend the wild vagaries of the eccentric German. It evident ly aims to spiritualize into a confusing mysticism all the grea verities of the Christian faith. The following language cannot b misunderstood.

"The primitive Trinity represents neither three originant principles, n three transient phases, but three eternal *influences* in one Divine mind."- "The unity of God as the eternal Father is the fundamental doctrine Christianity, but the Divine consciousness, or wisdom consubstantial wi the Eternal Will, becoming personal in the Son of man, is the express im age of the Father, and Jesus actually, but also mankind ideally is the S of God. If all this has a Sabellian, or almost a Brahminical sound, i impugners are bound, even on patristic grounds, to show how it differs fro the doctrine of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and the historia Eusebius."

In regard to Bunsen, the writer says:

"Our own testimony is, where we have been best able to follow him, w have generally found most reason to agree with him."

But we will understand more clearly in what company Dr Temple permitted himself to be found as a recommendation for hi

elevation to the Episcopate by a few other extracts from the writings of the volume to which his name and talents certainly gave a more extensive currency. We do not hesitate to affirm that they tend to undermine the whole foundation of our Christian Faith. They appear not so much nascent Rationalism as matured Infidelity. However, as our chief object in this Article is to expose a single position of Bishop Temple's own Essay, we will refrain comment on the opinions of his friends, and give simply two extracts from their contributions.

Prof. Baden Powell on "the Study of the Evidences of Christianity" says:

"The Philosophy of the age does not discredit the inspiration of Prophets and Apostles, though it may sometimes believe it in poets, legislators and philosophers, and others gifted with high genius." "If miracles were, in the estimation of a former age among the chief supports of Christianity, they are at present among the main difficulties, and hindrances to its acceptance." "Testimony after all is but a second-hand assurance; it is but a blind guide; testimony can avail nothing as against reason." "In nature and from nature, by science, and by reason, we neither have, nor can possibly have, any evidence of a Deity working miracles."

As Prof. Baden Powell thus would subvert the whole supernatural attestation of the Scriptures, so Prof. Benjamin Jowett denies any divine inspiration of the Scriptures which would preserve them from mistake, and make them an infallible standard of truth, and an unquestioned object of faith. But we will let him express his own opinions in his own words. He says in the Essay on "The Interpretation of Scripture:"—

"Nor for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels, or Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings that the Evangelists or Apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them different from that of preaching or teaching which they daily exercised, nor do they anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity." "There is no appearance that is to say of insincerity, or want of faith; but neither is there perfect accuracy or agreement." "The time will come when educated men will be no more able to believe that the words 'Out of Egypt have I called my son,' were intended by the Prophet to refer to the return of Joseph and Mary from Egypt, than they are able to believe the Roman Catholic explanation of Genesis iii. 15. 'Ipsa conteret caput tuum.' They will no more think that the first Chapter of Genesis relates the same tale which Geology and Ethnology unfold than they now think the meaning of Joshua x. 12, 13, to be in accordance with Galileo's discovery."

Surely if Christendom was shocked when distinguished members of the Church of England wrote in the style, and breathed the spirit, and repeated the arguments of German Rationalism, it was not less shocked to behold united in their infidel work an eminent Priest of the Church of England, who had subscribed her Articles, and been ordained by her Bishops, and been supported by her revenues, and been sworn to her defence. Nor can we wonder that Religion is grieved when the offence both of Frederick Temple and his associates is publicly sanctioned by the Bishop of Exeter, before his venerable brethren assembled in that very Convocation whose object is to preserve and diffuse an uncorrupted faith in the Divine Oracles as an inspired Revelation of the will of God.

But it is not the only mistake of our Essayist to have labored with suspicious persons whose writings tended to injure the authority of the Sacred Scriptures. We venture to affirm that in a few sentences he has inculcated what, if true, logically and inevitably would sweep away both the supernatural attestations of our Holy Religion, and its sacred mysteries. He states:

"The time was come when it was fit to trust to Conscience as a *supreme guide.*" "When Conscience and the Bible appear to differ, the pious Christian immediately concludes that he has not understood the Bible." "The current is all one way; it evidently points to the identification of the Bible with the voice of Conscience." "This it does by virtue of the principle of private judgment which puts Conscience between us and the Bible; making Conscience the supreme interpreter, whom it may be a duty to enlighten, but whom it can never be a duty to disobey." "If historical investigation shall show us that inspiration, however it may protect the doctrine, yet was not empowered to protect the narrative of the inspired writers from occasional inaccuracy—the result should still be welcome."

Here Conscience is styled both the guide and interpreter of Divine Truth, never to be disobeyed, while proof that the Scriptures were not preserved from error by the Holy Spirit would be received with pleasure by the writer. Certainly this is an anomalous and startling position for either a Priest, or a Bishop of the Church of England. Perhaps nothing is more variable than the human Conscience. Nothing more requires education. Nothing leads to more pernicious deceptions. The Conscience of the Boodhist tears his flesh with iron. The Conscience of the Romanist impels to the supplication of saints. The Conscience of the Thug sanctions murder. The Conscience, allied to taste and sensibility, like them

tuates in its decisions, and has not the steadiness of Reason, the king of the soul. Hence the necessity that it must itself e recourse to some reliable standard, which shall be at once educator and its guide. But the entire position of Dr. Tem- s Essay involves both a philosophical and a theological error. The proper sphere of Conscience is not the investigation of h, but the decision between right and wrong. It is a guide ier in conduct than in doctrine. It has its office in passing gment on our actions, but is not at all the director in our in- igations. Dr. Temple's assertion would remove everything in Scriptures relating to evidence, and dogma from the domain of mind, and clouds with confusion the most obvious distinctions ur faculties. Perhaps the German term "Consciousness," as ressing rather a condition of the soul—a species of totality, uding the entire mental and moral being—would have been re philosophical and less dangerous. Yet such a state is clearly result of discipline, and produced by all the varied influences, ch affect an individual, a nation, an age. Indeed, whatever ms to elevate the soul of man above the Word of God, and un- le faith in the Scriptures as an inspired standard of truth is ilous to every interest of Religion, and certainly in antagonism he teaching and genius of the Anglican Church. The very of the term Conscience, where both philosophical and theologi- accuracy would employ Reason, is itself a suspicious circum- nce. As the former faculty always involves some consideration regard to right and wrong, to style it the sole guide, and arbiter ruth, would seem a studious effort to inculcate that the Scrip- e is a book of morals, and not a book of doctrines, or a book of steries, and hence associates Bishop Temple with those Ration- its who will extol the precepts of the Divine Word, and yet seek sweep from it every supernatural element. In all investigations ching the truth of the Bible, we must regard its two-fold aspect. first reveals a moral code intelligible to Reason. We can easily ceive the universal fitness of the ten commandments. Their ob- vance promotes, individual, and social, and national happiness. ey carry with them their own sanction, while the fire, and the nder, and the earthquake, and the cloud, and the voice might, ve been necessary to impress them on a rude people long encir- d by idolatries. Yet, in the intellectual advances of the race

their *excellence* is their authentication. Expanded by the precepts of the Gospel, and illustrated in the life of our Saviour they form a perfect rule for human life in every age of the world, and in every period of time. The exposition of Jesus Christ resolving the moral law into love to God and man, contains in principle an epitome of conduct not only for beings on earth, but in heaven. Yet even here it is erroneous to say that Conscience is our guide, and interpreter. It is Reason alone which can demonstrate truth. Conscience simply approves or disapproves where we apply it to our actions.

But the Bishop of Exeter, as a Clergyman of the Church of England is supposed to receive more than the Moral Code of the Scriptures. He is sworn to faith in doctrines not only removed from the sphere of Conscience but even beyond the comprehension of Reason. Before God, and man he has solemnly avowed his belief in the Trinity, in the Divinity of our Lord, and in the Resurrection from the dead. In regard to these there is not a single proof in nature, nor have they any immediate connection with Conscience. Yet they are to be received by the intellect, to be embraced by the heart, to affect the entire character. Our view of the Trinity influences all our approaches to God in prayer. Our view of the incarnation, and death of our Lord Jesus Christ determines the whole nature of our service. Our view of the Resurrection colors all our hopes of immortality. Now since Bishop Temple is pledged to faith in the Mysteries of our Religion, which are not only to enter the mind, but to impress the life, we may ask him how upon his theory that Conscience is his supreme guide and only interpreter, can he believe truths in regard to which Conscience cannot at all pronounce? His position involves a contradiction, and an absurdity. That man who believes the Mysteries of our holy Religion is logically compelled to admit the supernatural in their proof, and can no longer graduate truths either by the decisions of his Conscience, or the comprehension of his Reason. Yet both these faculties have their proper and healthful relation to Christianity. Why does not Bishop Temple bow to the Pope when he would impose on the world the dogma of his infallibility? Why does the intelligence of the age revolt from the arrogance of the Vatican? Why do men deride the imposing pageantries which are dazzling Rome? Simply because the lofty

to inspiration has no authentication. Yet we believe the
:et, and the Apostle, and the Saviour where we refuse cre-
to Doctors, and Bishops, and Popes. The difference is ob-
Where the Scriptural writers declare moral precepts com-
nsible by our Reason we may embrace their teaching because
es recommended to our intelligence. But where the Scrip-
writers declare awful Mysteries beyond the comprehension of
eason, we demand what the Vatican cannot furnish—*a super-
al authentication.* A sign from Heaven in such a case must
credential of the Ambassador of Heaven. Where Myste-
re revealed, Miracles are not only suitable but essential.
is indeed no other possible proof. Reason then finds its no-
office in the examination of the evidence which is presented,
the interpretation of the truth which is revealed. Surely,
can be no higher function than to investigate the fact of
les, the truth of Prophecy, the internal fitness and beauty,
cellence of the Scripture, and then to explore Language,
ry, Chronology, Science and every department of Human
ledge in the elucidation of the sacred text, and the applica-
f its truths to the regulation of each individual life. And
truest sense our Holy Christianity instead of being the
is the friend of Reason. She appeals to Reason in the in-
ation of her moral precepts. She appeals to Reason in the
ination of those supernatural evidences which authenticate
comprehensible Mysteries. She appeals to Reason in the in-
tation of her inspired Revelation. She appeals to Reason in
plication of abstract principles to individual conduct. She
ls to Reason in those methods which are to relieve human
ing, instruct human ignorance, and conquer the human race
the entire world to the sway of her Divine Saviour. She
ore looks with suspicion on those sworn advocates of her
, who supported by her revenues, and under the sanction of
ame, seek alliance with men who insult her majesty by as-
g that in her Miracles and her Mysteries she is the foe of
n, and the ally of superstition. And when we consider the
declaration of Bishop Temple's Essay and its necessary logi-
nsequences, when we consider that his associates have ques-
l the inspiration of the Scripture, and disturbed confidence
supernatural proofs, when we consider that his nomination

and consecration awakened the exultation of Rationalism throughout the world, when we consider how his late explanations in Convocation have not only sanctioned his own Essay, but vindicated the publication of the offensive Volume, it is not strange that his position in the Episcopate should be regarded with alarm by the Anglican Church—nay more by Orthodox Christendom. Indeed, his appointment may yet prove one in a long series of events which seem tending both to disestablishment and revolution. But whatever the result, we are confident that there remains a glorious future both for the English Church, and the English Nation.

ART. IV.—THE DIVINE LIFE AND THE NEW BIRTH.

By the REV. JAMES CRAIK, D. D., *Rector of Christ's Church, Louisville; Author of "Search of Truth," "Old and New," etc.*

Christ the Desire of all Nations, or, *The Unconscious Prophecies of Heathendom: Being The Hulsean Lectures for the Year* 1846. *By* RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, M. A.

THE Incarnation of the Son of God, for the Redemption of fallen man, was the beginning of that great work of salvation, which He came to accomplish for our race. But that those whose nature He took, may become partakers of this salvation, they must receive the life of God and in God, which is communicated to us from the Incarnate Lord.

The question presented in the book of Dr. Craik, whose title is at the head of this Article, is, how and when this Divine Life is communicated from the Incarnate Lord to those whom He came to save. Did He, by His Incarnation, endow the nature of man, which He took into union with His Divine Person, as it successively comes into being in each person, with His life, *or*, did He present Himself to men, as the Way, the Truth, and the Life; did He, by His Work of Redemption, accomplished here on earth, and proclaimed by His ascension to heaven as a finished work, win this divine life for fallen man, by His victory over sin, death, and hell, and then, in the preaching of His Gospel under His own di-

vine commission, reveal it and offer it to all, who would receive it in His own appointed sacrament of regeneration, in the New Birth ordinarily, and by His covenant of grace, the pledge and the beginning of that life coming from Him, which would be, to them, the regaining of the life of God in the soul, previously lost by the fall of man from his condition in Paradise?

Or, to state these questions in other words—Is the Incarnation, ipso facto, the gift of the divine life from Christ to all men without exception, whose nature He took; *or*, is the New Birth of water and of the Spirit the revealed beginning, in each individual man, who is so new born, of that divine life, which has been provided for all men, who will receive it, by the Incarnation, and by the Work of Redemption considered as the development of the Incarnation in the fulness of its life and power?

The answer given in the book of Dr. Craik is, that by the first of these methods, the divine life is imparted to all men for whom the Son of God became incarnate, and that the New Birth of water and of the Spirit is simply the introduction of those, who have received this Divine Life to the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, there to be fed, nourished, strengthened and perfected, by all the means of grace. To prove, illustrate and enforce this position in its connection with all the arrangements of the Christian Church, and all the applications to men of the saving power of the Religion of Christ, is the object of Dr. Craik's able, interesting, and well-written work.

He mentions these three presentments of Christianity as the only three Gospels, which are proclaimed among men, and the first it is his object to set forth as the only true Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the only true exposition of the life and grace that flow to man from His Incarnation. "One," he says, p. 71:

"Is the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who came into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." That Gospel teaches,

1st. That the entire race of man is by *nature* fallen, degenerate, dead. That each human being is so 'far gone from original righteousness, as *of his own nature to be inclined to evil*,' so that 'the flesh *lusteth always contrary to the spirit*,' and '*is not subject to the law of God*.' Art. 9.

2d. That the Second Person of the Adorable Trinity assumed our nature that He might become the second Adam, and give to that nature a new and

better life, and that the Incarnate Saviour suffered death upon the cross for the redemption of all mankind, 'and made there a full perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.'

3d. That from the right hand of the Eternal Majesty, where He ever liveth to make intercession for us, He hath given gifts unto men, even the inestimable gift of His Holy Spirit, to be the Teacher, Monitor and Guide of the souls for which He died; and to dwell in the hearts of men, the principle of a new and divine life, the bond of reunion between God and man.

4th. That this redemption and this consequent gift are as extensive and as universal as the previous condemnation, which has come into the world by sin. Accordingly we are assured that the sacrifice of Christ and the benefits of that sacrifice were made over to mankind—to the entire race of man—from the foundation of the world.

5th. The divine life thus given to every man is a germ, a seed, which does not necessarily, and by the force of the mere gift, destroy and take the place of the carnal nature, but co-exists with that carnal nature, and enters into conflict with all that is evil and depraved in the natural life; and, if properly entertained and nurtured, will ultimately overcome, mortify and kill all the evil of corrupt nature, and substitute for that evil purity, goodness, and every divine affection.

6th. The Church of Christ, with all its appliances of faith and holiness, has been appointed as the last, the fullest, and the most perfect of the means and instrumentalities for the nurture and development of the divine life, from its embryo existence as a power in the soul of man, through all the successive stages of growth, to the maturity of perfect manhood in Jesus Christ; and to be introduced into that Church by Baptism is the second birth—the birth of water and of the Spirit.

One of the other gospels to which we have referred teaches,

1st. That the gift of God, the Holy Spirit, the Divine Life, is imparted only to the baptized. That it begins in Baptism, and is inseparably connected with that sacrament.

2d. That the Divine Life, by the mere gift thereof, effectually and at once destroys the carnal life—the whole evil of corrupt nature—reuniting the subject of this gift to the state of Adam before the fall, making him pure, immaculate, without sin.

3d. The same system teaches that this pure and spotless being, may, nevertheless, fall, as Adam fell by sin; in which case the divine life, before imparted, is in its turn utterly extinguished and destroyed; and the carnal life, by an anticipated resurrection, reappears in full strength and development, and resumes its previous sway and mastery over the soul.

4th. For this new and terrible incident of humanity, unknown to the true Gospel, and unprovided for there, the new Gospel has invented a supplementary sacrament of far more practical value and efficacy than the sacrament of Baptism which our blessed Lord provided. For, according to the system we are now describing, the supplemental sacrament of penance reconveys the divine life to the soul in full maturity and strength, just as often as it may be forfeited and lost by sin.

There is yet, 'another Gospel,' very similar in some of its features to the last mentioned, but differing from it in other particulars. It agrees with it in denying peremptorily that the gift of God, the Holy Spirit, the Divine Life, is bestowed impartially upon all mankind. But instead of restricting this gift to the baptized, and looking upon Baptism as the instrument by which it is conferred, this other Gospel teaches,

1st. That the gift of the Eternal Spirit is bestowed only upon those whom it terms converted persons, and who have passed through certain experiences, and have been moved by a peculiar class of feelings designated as the New Birth.

So far the maintainers of this Gospel, which constitutes the popular theology of the day, go together in entire harmony of statement.

But at this point two parties are presented to our view, who go as far asunder as possible. The smaller of these teaches,

2d. That the converted persons, upon whom the Holy Spirit is bestowed have been previously designated by an eternal decree; and that the recipients of this divine life can never lose it, or fail to secure the everlasting reward of the righteous."

The larger class of the adherents of the popular theology maintain, instead of the last proposition,

"3d. That men may fall from grace. That the Divine Life may be often lost and recovered; and that the way to recover it is to repeat the process by which it was first obtained—that is, by certain well-known appliances, to stimulate the feelings, and to seek for the experiences which were at first regarded as the beginning and the assurance of the divine Life."

Now we venture to say that there is another Gospel, which Dr. Craik does not specify, which he identifies, in fact, with the second Gospel that he does specify, which we propose to maintain and set forth as the true Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as that Gospel contained in Holy Scripture, and witnessed to and proclaimed by His Catholic Church, in an unbroken line of testimony from the day of Pentecost to our own time. In exhibiting what we hope to show is the True Gospel issuing from the commission of the risen Lord, we shall mark the lines of separation and distinction of this Gospel, which the Church has from the first, and through the ages proclaimed, from the Gospel, which, in the Book, "The Divine Life and the New Birth," now before us, is earnestly commended as the only Gospel, proceeding from the fountain of revealed divine truth.

We will first state what this gospel is, that we may supply an unhappy omission, which we find in the Book of Dr. Craik.

In the first place this Gospel teaches (we use the language of Mr. Craik's book, where it is coincident with the true Gospel of our Lord, as contained in Scripture, and held by His Catholic Church) that the entire race of man is fallen, that each man

"Is very far gone from original righteousness, and is, of his own nature, inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit;" "and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation."

2d. That the Second Person of the Adorable Trinity assumed our nature that He might become the Second Adam, and give to that nature a new and better life, and that the Incarnate Saviour suffered death upon the Cross for the redemption of all mankind, and made there "a full perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

3d. That from the right hand of the Eternal Majesty where He ever liveth to make intercession for us, He hath given gifts unto men, even the inestimable gift of His Holy Spirit to be the teacher, monitor, and guide of the souls for which He died; and to dwell in the hearts of men, *who receive Him as He is offered by the preaching of the gospel, and in the sacrament of our new birth unto God*, the principle of a new and divine life, the bond of reunion between God and man.

4th. That the divine life, *in those who receive it*, is a germ, a seed, which does not necessarily and by the force of the mere gift, destroy and take the place of the carnal nature, but co-exists with that "*infection of nature*," *which remains* "*yea in them that are regenerated*," and enters into conflict with all that is evil and depraved in the natural life; and, if properly entertained and nurtured, will ultimately overcome, mortify and kill all the evil of corrupt nature, and substitute for that evil, purity, goodness, and every divine affection.

5th. That the Church of Christ with all its appliances of faith and holiness has been appointed *as the revealed and covenant means and instrumentality* for the nurture and development of the divine life from its "*beginning*" in Christian infancy, in the soul of man, through all the successive stages of growth, to the maturity of perfect manhood in Jesus Christ; and to be introduced into that Church by Baptism is the second birth, the birth of water

and of the Spirit, which is *the beginning of that divine life, which we have in and through the Incarnation of the Son of God.*

We have marked in italics the distinctions of this Gospel, which Dr. Craik has omitted to specify from that Gospel, which he propounds as the only true Gospel of our Lord and Saviour.

The question is not what God may do or has done, by extraordinary dispensations of His grace, which hath appeared unto all men, (as for all Christ became Incarnate and died,) for men, who are out of the Christian Church, or who have never heard the Gospel preached under our Lord's great commission. We freely grant that He may confer, or that He may have bestowed the gift of the divine life, of the indwelling Spirit of Christ, upon those who are not of His Church, or who have never heard of Christ, but we maintain that such is not the ordinary and revealed dispensation for the communication, to men, of the life, which introduces them to the new creation in Christ Jesus. We do not believe, nor is it the teaching of Holy Scripture, that men in their fallen condition, are incapable of receiving the grace of God, that there is no residuum of a spiritual nature in man, even in his fallen condition, to which the Spirit of God can join Himself, and so, by His grace, lead men, themselves willingly following, to the reception of the divine life provided for them in Christ.

Now this incapacity to receive the grace of God, this incapability (p. 87,) "of thinking, doing, or desiring any good thing," this "deadness to goodness and to God," (p. 87), this incapacity "to *hear*, receive, and believe the Gospel," (p. 92), this denial to the natural man of "all capacity for good," (p. 80), which is equivalent to incapacity for the sanctifying grace of God, is what Dr. Craik unequivocally asserts to be the condition to which the Fall has reduced us, and hence the Divine life engrafted upon this nature totally depraved, utterly ruined, and unspiritualized, is absolutely needful to enable any man to take the very first step in the progressive work of his salvation.

But we submit that, in a being in such a condition, there would be no place of entertainment for the Divine Spirit, much less any stock of spiritual life whatsoever, upon which the graft of the Divine life could be inserted by the Spirit, which communicates the life that comes from Christ. We believe, and we think it demonstrable that man, though very far gone from original righteousness,

as far as it is possible for him to go, remaining man, though as the Homily of the Church hath it, "we be all crab-trees," nevertheless has spiritual life, though perverted and twisted into strange deformities, by the life of sin incorporated with it, upon which the graft from the Incarnation of the Lord can be inserted, and draw from the spiritual nature which God has made, its heavenward growth and its Divine fruitfulness, and the assertion of the reality of the spiritual nature of man, and its consequent receptivity of the Grace of the Incarnation, we hold to be a fundamental position for the maintenance of the possibility of benefit to man from the Redemption of Christ.

That we will not come to Christ till drawn by the Grace of the Holy Spirit, we entirely agree with Dr. Craik in asserting from Holy Scripture, and as a truth clearly stated and defined by the Church among the recorded results of the controversy with the Pelagians and the Semi-Pelagians. We could quote, if it were needful, the determinations of the Council of Orange, fully and clearly to the purpose, on this important and fundamental point of our Christian Belief. However that the salvation of Christ may be a possibility for man, we are constrained to admit that he is a spiritual being, capable as such, of receiving the gracious access of the Spirit, who confers the New Life in Christ Jesus. But to maintain that he must receive this Divine life to make him capable of being blessed and saved by the Incarnate Lord, would remove him as far from the possibility of salvation, as if he were a beast, a stock, or a stone.

Here then is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the Gospel, which is put forth, in Dr. Craik's Book, as the only Gospel of Truth. If the Fall had extinguished man's spiritual nature and capacity instead of perverting and disordering it, and calling it away from its true and normal attachment to the life of the Father of Spirits, then, for men, has the Son of God become Incarnate and died in vain. It was when we were in that strength, and not without all spiritual life, which is the endowment of our nature, that Christ died for the ungodly. If the Fall had blotted out, from the spiritual universe of God, the spiritual nature of man, then there would have been nought for the Spirit of God to work upon, in the long ages of preparation for the coming of Christ; there would have been no darkness, not comprehending the Light whose intensity, for those long

es, the Light was seeking to penetrate; the spiritual history of an would have been a delusion, and the attempt to save him ould never have elicited the sympathizing and wondering gaze of igels desiring to look into the mysteries of Redemption—the mysries of the approach of the Spirit, who had received the things Christ, to show them unto men, whose spiritual capacities were rmed for a higher and nobler destiny, than that, which they were eking to realize amid the pervading darkness of sin and death.

We commend to the attention of those who would see the true arting point of Redemption, in its application to man, the condion in which he was created, and that to which he had fallen, from hich he was to be redeemed, the masterly treatise of Bishop Bull i the State of Adam before the Fall, as he illustrates and enfors the views, which have been those of the Catholic Church of hrist, in all ages of its history.

About the gift, which Christ provided for men, as the result of his accomplished work of Redemption, the gift of the Divine life take possession of and rule the life of man, we can have, we are ost happy to say, no difference with the writer of the Book on the Divine Life and the New Birth. But we must take the Gospel of ur Lord in its totality—and we must learn, from His Revelation, ow this gift is to be applied to men, and received by them, as well as ow it is to be provided for all men who will entertain it. And re do learn from the disciple, who spoke from the bosom of the ord Himself, that "*to as many as received Him* gave He power o become the sons of God, even to as many as believe on His ame." It strikes us that if the Gospel of Christ were the Gosel proclaimed in the book before us, as the only true one, that, in hat passage of Holy Scripture, which treats expressly of the Inarnation and its application to men, where the beloved Disciple s speaking of the true light, which, coming from the world, enighteneth every man, that, instead of reading, as it does at presnt, "But as many as received Him," it would and must have ead thus—"That was the True Light, which coming into the world enlighteneth every man, and *because* He came, the Light of the World, *all men* have the life from Him, which gives them power (*capacity* is Dr. Craik's word) to become the sons of God." But because the reading is "*as many as received Him*," by believing on His name, we are constrained to believe and say, that belief

and baptism ("he that believeth and is baptized" are the words of the Great Commission,) are the revealed and appointed ways of receiving and communicating that life of Christ, by which we are saved, that is, put into a state of salvation in and through Him.

We are arrested by this grand exposition in the first Chapter of St. John's Gospel. It opens to us the clear truths of the Divine Life among men out of Christ and in Christ; and, taken in connection with the discourse of our Lord with Nicodemus in the same Gospel, the truth of the relation of the Divine Life to the Birth of Water and of the Spirit, which is our entrance into the kindgom of God, we have represented to us, in the first place, the mysterious and co-essential relation to God of the Word, which was in the beginning, was with God, and was God. He is revealed to us, as the Creator of the Universe, and Himself Uncreated. In Him we are emphatically told, was life, even the life which was the light of men, that very Divine life offered from Him, which is the subject of our present contemplation. And then, we are told that this light was shining, through all the ages, in darkness, the spiritual darkness, in which men were enshrouding themselves, and, during all those ages, (that was the condition of men before the coming of Christ,) the darkness did not comprehend, did not take to itself and appropriate the life, which was the light of men, but, because they would not receive it, it was not light in them and so, in them, the Divine life. For God is light, and those in whom this life is, have Him, the light, within them. But the light, man in his natural, fallen condition, did not comprehend, did not receive it, and so had not this life.

In this sad condition of the world, there was a change, so to speak, in the Divine plan; men had not received the Light as it had been presented, and then it was presented to them in another way, in the form of a clear and open Revelation, which they could consciously embrace, and so by their own reception, in compliance with this revelation, receive the life. "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John," to bear witness of that light, which had been shining among men so long, and they comprehended it not, to herald His coming in the flesh as the Incarnate Word. And when He came, not *all* simply because He came for all, but as many as received Him, to them He gave the power to become the sons of God. Whether this power be the first faint be-

aning of life before birth, as Dr. Craik, in some places, reprents the Divine life; which, he says, is in all men by virtue of e Incarnation, but which he usually identifies with the Divine e that comes from the Incarnate Word, whether, the power to come the sons of God be antenatal or natal life, it is clear that is not represented as being given to all, by virtue of the Incartion, but to as many as received Him, even to them that beve on His name.

Can any statement be clearer than this of the Divine Apostle? hat the natural man had not, either before or after His coming, as given to those who were His, who had received Him in the way His own Appointment, who were *Born*, not of blood, (not natal men) nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of od.

This Birth is surely no other than that of which our Lord spoke Nicodemus, the second Birth of Water and of the Spirit, by hich we enter the Kingdom of God. The New Birth, then, of ater and of the Spirit, is, if we follow the teaching of St. John, e very Entrance upon, the very Reception of the Divine Life, hich comes to us through Christ. It was because men had not is Life, out of that Kingdom, which arose from His Incarnation, hether before or after His Coming, that He came to communicate to those who would receive it by being *born* into His Kingdom.

That then, under the Gospel of Christ, is the revealed and apinted Way, by which we become partakers of the Divine Life hich Christ is, and which is the Light of men.

Where we have so clear a statement, in the words of Divine Inpiration, of the manner, that is, the ordinary and revealed manner which the Incarnation is applied to make us participants of the ivine Life in Christ, we are precluded from a theory, however scinating it may be to the Charity which hopeth and deviseth all ings for all men, as that Charity may shape itself in the indidual mind of any man, which asserts as from the Revelation of od Himself, that the Incarnation, ipso facto, endows the nature man, as it successfully comes into being in each person, with e Life of Christ. We take the Revelation of Christ, as He has ven it to us, and whatever we may hope or believe for our fellowen out of the pale of the Covenant of Grace, we will not rest these inions upon the basis of any clear Revelation from Him, as that

is, which tells us how we are made partakers of the Life of the Incarnate Saviour of men.

But this pregnant passage of St. John's Gospel, which is the normal one in the Incarnation and its relation to men in and out of Christ, is not yet exhausted of its bearing upon the subject before us. It contains the text, which, beyond all others, might be pleaded, if any could be put in plea, for the Gospel, which we are called to believe, against the current of teaching in the Catholic Church, as the true Gospel of our Lord; it is this, "That was the true Light, which, coming into the world, enlighteneth every man." Is not this full and plain? Is not Christ the Light of each and every man, so that each and every man has the Divine Life from Him? It might be so, if, in the same passage, we were not told, where the application of this Light to men is stated, that, to as many as received Him, who were born with the New Birth, He gave the power to become the sons of God, if we were not told, moreover, in the same passage, that this True Light which enlighteneth every man, was in the world, (after His Incarnation) and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not, and so all men in it had not received power to become the sons of God, had not received, in virtue of the Incarnation, the Divine Life, which comes from the Incarnate Son of God alone. We are forced then to conclude that the declaration that Christ was the True Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, is entirely synonymous with the declaration of the Lord Himself for example, in the 8th chapter of St. John's Gospel, v. 13, "I am the Light of the world," where the immediately subsequent words of the Lord uttered in the same breath, teach us that He did not mean to say that He was the Light of the world by imparting the Divine Light to every man, by the simple fact and virtue of His Incarnation for He adds, "He that *followeth* Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the Light of life, or, "of *the* life." So that the Reception of Christ, in His revealed and appointed Way, is the means, by which we become partakers of the Divine Life, which there is in His Incarnation and concerning those, who do not so receive Him, it is not revealed that they are partakers of this life, though He *is* the True Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world; and though He *is* the Light of the world.

Undoubtedly this proposition of the Gospel keeps mysteries sealed with regard to the race of man, which it would be most desirable to us, as it seems, to have opened: but "the secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever." We might pursue this argument through the pages of the New Testament, and, everywhere, we fear not to say we should find the same answer, the same proposition of the Gospel, and declaration and appointment concerning the way of its application to the salvation of men: but we desire not to prolong discussion into tediousness, where it is sufficient for elucidation.

We refer to the Great Commission of the Lord, which was a direction for the application to men, of His work of Redemption, and for the communication to them of His Divine Life, which was in Him for all men, and we read, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." We refer to the Preaching of the day of Pentecost, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." We refer to the great object of the Gospel, which was to confer upon men a Gift, which they had not received, a Life, which they had not; and this was to be accomplished through the commission, into which our Lord had put His Gospel, for the declaration and communication of the Life that comes from Him. We refer to the description of the Gentile world, as given by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who says, that they were alienated (the Greek word is a strong and expressive one) from the Life of God, and surely *they* did not possess the Divine Life, simply because Christ had become Incarnate. And certain we are that the Great Apostle of the Gentiles would not have magnified his office as he did, and would not have poured out his life in the ardor of his mission, if he had not been impelled by the conviction that he was carrying to the Gentiles, a Life of God, which they had not through the ignorance that was in them. It was because a dispensation of the Gospel was committed to him, upon which depended the reception by men of the Life of the Incarnation, or their continued alienation from that Blessed Divine Life, that he was so straitened in spirit, to enlarge the bounds of his teaching, that all the Gentiles might hear, and that it was woe to him if he preached not the Gospel.

Strange preaching indeed would it have been for one, who believed that every man had the Divine Life in Christ, to address them with the trumpet call, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." No, we say, a thousand times, no; men, who preach the Gospel to a world lying in the darkness of sin and spiritual ignorance must be possessed with the truth, that it is the question of the reception of life, which Christ has commissioned His preachers to offer to man; OR of their continued alienation from this life, which is to be settled by each and every man, who is not yet born into the Kingdom of Grace, before their preaching can agree with the terms of the Lord's commission, or have the unction of the Pentecostal Day.

Dr. Craik, we are bound to say, puts together Universal Redemption by Christ and the Reception, by men, of the Divine life from Him, in a way not sustained by the tenor of the Scriptures, which open to us both of these parts of the scheme of Redemption. That Christ became incarnate and died for all men is a truth, which the Scriptures clearly teach, but that His Universal Redemption is applied to all men in the implantation of the Divine life, by virtue of the Incarnation, they do *not* teach.

"This Redemption from death, and this consequent gift of life are as extensive and as universal as the previous condemnation, which had come into the world by sin. For as the Blessed Saviour came to make an atonement for the sins of mankind, He is declared to be 'the True Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' St. John, i. 9." And again. "It is this universality of Redemption, and of the capacity of salvation, which truly entitles the Revelation of Jesus Christ to be called the Gospel or 'glad tidings of great joy to all people;' this was the description which the Angels gave of that which they came to announce, when at the birth of the Son of God they sang, 'Peace on Earth, good will to man.'".

These are the words of Dr. Craik stating the Gospel, which he propounds, in avowed opposition to that which is most generally received and taught in the Church, and how far he ignores one great class of Scripture teaching, which shows us how the Universal Redemption of Christ is made applicable to those, who receive Him, by the implantation of the Divine Life, by the Spirit, in and through the Church, we have perhaps sufficiently indicated.

There is, moreover, a confusion in his statements, between the influences of the Spirit, as they may be given to all men out of

e Christian Covenant, and the Divine Life, which is ordinarily ven in and through the Covenant, as if these two were one and e same. Here, for example, is a passage, (p. 88), in which he ys:

"How then is this new and Divine Life imparted? The answer to the estion explains to us the reason for the Revelation to man of the adorable rstery of the Holy Trinity. As the Eternal Son became our Redeemer, ediator and Effectual Intercessor; so, to complete the work which He be-n, to make effectual for our Salvation, His Sacrifice, Mediation, and Inter-ssion, the Holy Ghost was sent to dwell in the hearts of men; to be the ent of reunion between God and man; to be the source and beginning of at new life from which comes the capacity of holiness, the power to know d love God, and to obey and love His commands. * * * * * And in the counsels of the Divine Economy, the Son was slain from the foun-tion of the world, that men might be pardoned and accepted for His sake, was the gift of the Holy Ghost, the purchase of that Son's death and love, ade over to mankind from the beginning, that in every man born into the orld there might be a capacity for holiness and for Heaven." And again, . 147). "The Recognition of the great gift of God—the *Divine Life in soul of man*—rescues that important truth, the corruption of human na-re, from the unhappy connections with which it has been too often con-sed, and by which it has been discredited. But unless we connect with at great Scriptural truth the *universal gift* (the Italics his) through Christ, *the spirit of life and light, to operate upon depraved humanity.*" Now what the first part of the passage he calls "the great gift of God—the Divine fe in the soul of man—" in a few lines below he calls "the *universal gift*, rough Christ, of the spirit of life and light, to operate upon depraved hu-anity."

These two things are not, we affirm, the same. There are many, ho would concede, as a truth which they firmly believe, the *last*, ho would *not* affirm that the Divine Life in the soul of man, hich comes through Christ, is, in the manifest, ordinary way of ivine Dispensation, given to those, who are unbaptized and un-elieving. It would detract, in their view, from the peculiar glory Christianity, to make this affirmation.

For the Church comes to men, under the commission of her ord, bearing, to them, a gift from Heaven of a life, which they ave not received. Men, who are dead in trespasses and sins, she alls to be quickened together with Christ, and with the Great postle of the Gentiles, she tells men, not that they all, but who nong them are so quickened; for, "as many of you, as have een baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Indeed, so high

and peculiar is the great gift of Divine Life through Christ, that, even of the saints of the old dispensation, we are told, "these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they, without us, should not be made perfect." They had, doubtless, largely, "the Spirit of life and light to operate upon" the "depraved humanity" within them, but the gift of the Divine Life in Christ, did they have this, so that, without us, they can be made perfect? This gift was surely provided for men because they needed it, and the revealed necessity of the ordinary dispensation of it to the individuals of our race, by the administration of the Spirit in the Church, is as clear a part of the Divine Revelation, as is the Universality of the Redemption, for all mankind, by the Eternal Incarnate Son.

Another peculiarity in Dr. Craik's statements is that he utterly denies the existence of natural conscience in fallen man, (p. 93). "All of conscience that would seem to be left to mere nature by this description of the office of the Holy Spirit, (St. John xvi. 8), is simple sensibility to the impressions and monitions of the Spirit." Now, unless this sensibility includes the power of distinguishing Right from Wrong, and the idea of moral obligation, we can hardly see what there is in man for the Spirit of God to work upon. "Neither is it the part of the natural conscience to be the *guide* or the *teacher* of men," (p. 92) says Dr. Craik. "And herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men," saith St. Paul. And the same Apostle unequivocally asserts the action of conscience in heathen men, and supposes that they may so use it as to be a law unto themselves, and he speaks also of reason and conscience as being defiled by sin, but yet existing in those who have so misused them.

But the use is obvious which Dr. Craik makes of his assertion that, (p. 93).

"Conscience, that mysterious and transcendent power, seated in the human soul as a ruler and guide is no integral part of our fallen nature, but is the witness and voice of God Himself, dwelling in us by His Spirit, to govern and direct, yet in subordination to human will, all the *faculties* of Nature."

This is to trace all the good thoughts, feelings, and acts of men out of the pale of the Christian Church to the workings of the New Life which they have received from Christ, since these are

ruits of the Spirit in men, baptized and unbaptized, heathen and ominally Christian. They are proofs, which Dr. C. deems conlusive, of the indwelling of the Spirit in tho soul of every human eing that has ever lived.

On this view it is hard to see what else Human Nature would e, but a mere unspiritual scene of action, just as the natural 'orld is the sphere of human action, in which the Spirit of God lone enacts and produces the semblances of human virtue and raits of holiness, which then would be rather self-manifestations f the Spirit through a human medium, instead of fruits of the pirit produced from a spiritual soil capable of producing them.

But it is possible, surely, that man has a spiritual nature, the ffspring of God, the Father of Spirits, which, though broken and istorted by sin, may yet show traces in its thoughts, feelings, and cts, of its original, and so the fruits may be the same in manifesation, though not in the roots from which they spring, with the ruits of the Spirit enumerated by the Apostle. They may be agmentary, fitful, and detached from the will, and from conscious eference to God, to whom the allegiance of the spiritual nature of an is due, may be witnesses for God—witnesses, it may be, upeld and sustained by the Spirit of God operating on the spiritual ature of man,—to the reality of that spiritual nature; and yet, r all that, the men, in whom these ebullitions of their spiritual ature amid the waste of sin, are seen, may be alienated from the ife of God, through the ignorance that is in them; their wills ay be, by no means, in accordance with the holy will of God; eir virtues, however, in themselves, fair and acceptable in the es of men, may not have the roots of their permanence and true timation before God, in the Divine Life which comes to men, om Christ, and by these virtues scattered, separated, and deched, amid much that is perverted and nigh unto ruin, in their piritual being, no demonstration is given, that the Germ of the ife from the Incarnate Life of men, which is to take possession of e whole man in his faculties, his emotions, his conscience, his ason, and His Will, as it expands and grows, has ever been imlanted

Archbishop Trench has nobly treated the subject of the relaon of the Incarnate Son to all the humanity, for which He beame Incarnate, in his Hulsean Lectures for 1846, the title of

which is at the head of this Article. He shows that, in all the ages before Christ there were Unconscious Prophecies of Him in the sentiments, strivings, expectations, ethical theories, hopes and fears, in the whole life, in fact, of Heathendom, and that the appearance of the Great Deliverer was the true answer to all these notes of preparation that went before His coming. He broadly and clearly distinguishes between these blind and earnest searchings; and Life and Light, when revealed and offered to men, but shows, nevertheless, the correspondence between the preparation and the fulfilment. He admits fully and explicitly all that to us it seems should be admitted of the workings of Divine Grace in those realms of Heathendom, while he assigns, to the Church, her true office in the dispensation of that grace and life, which the heathen did not know, and did not possess. "Nor can we doubt," he says, (p. 273).

"That by *that* which we with our fuller knowledge, our larger grace, are inclined to slight, many were preserved from defilements, in which otherwise they had been inevitably entangled. This salt may have been powerless to give the savor of life to that with which it came in contact; but that progress of corruption, that dissolution of social and personal life, which it was unable ultimately to arrest, it yet retarded for a time. It preserved many a man for something better than itself, and in not a few cases of which we have distinct record, handed over in due time its votaries to the school of Christ."

And then he proceeds to mention the case of St. Augustine, arrested by the *Hortensius* of Cicero, and at length made the bright and shining light in the Church which he was. And so he says again, (p. 285).

"There will mingle in these studies thoughts and feelings of a liveliest thankfulness to God, as amid the great shipwreck of the Gentile world, we recognize the planks, by which one and another attained as we trust safely, and through the mercy of a Saviour whom as yet he did not know, to the shore of everlasting life—thankfulness mingled, it may oftentimes be, with something of an wholesome shame to ourselves, as we contemplate the faithfulness and fealty to the good and true, which even in the world's darkest hour have been shown by them, whose knowledge was so little, and whose advantages so few, as compared with our own. And perhaps it shall seem to us then, as if that star in the natural heavens which guided those Eastern Sages from their distant home, was but the symbol of many a star which twinkled in the world's mystical night—but which yet, being faithfully followed, availed to lead humble and devout hearts from far off regions of superstition and error, till they knelt beside the Cradle of the Babe of Bethlehem, and saw all their weary wanderings repaid in a moment, and all their desires finding a perfect fulfilment in Him."

And nobly with regard to man's capacity for Redemption does Archbishop Trench say: (p. 193.)

"But man's divine original, his first creation in the image of God, was so firmly held fast to by all nobler spirits, that St. Paul upon the hill of Mars, could at once take his stand on this as a great meeting point between himself and his Athenian hearers—as the ground which was common to them and him." "Certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring." (Acts xvii. 28.) Here at least they were at one.

"And it is possible that we may learn a lesson which we need, or at least remind ourselves of truths which we are in danger of suffering to fall too far back in our minds, by the contemplation of those, who, amid all their errors, and darkness, and confusion, and evil, had yet a sense so deeply imprinted, a faith so lively, that man was *from* God, as well as *to* God; capable of the divine, only because himself of a divine race. Oftentimes it would seem as if our theology of the present day had almost lost sight of this, or at least held it with only too feeble a grasp; beginning, as it so often does, from the fall, from the corruption of human nature, instead of beginning a step higher up—beginning with man a liar, when it ought to have begun with man, the true image and the glory of God." And the Incarnation he declares (p. 194) "to have been grounded on the perfect fitness of man, as the image of God, of man's organs, his affections, his life, to be the utterers and exponents of all the life, yea, of all the heart of God."

The Incarnation then, *ipso facto* demonstrated, that man was capable of Redemption, and a fit subject of Redemption, and did create the capability and the fitness, of which it was the testimony.

If the Divine Life from Christ were the Gift, to all men, from His Incarnation, simply because it has occurred, it is incredible that we should not have seen larger and more manifest fruits of the workings of this Life upon individuals and upon society than we have seen; or, if the Church and the preached Word be needful to develop and perfect this Life, then the mystery is only removed a step farther back, viz: the mystery of the granting of the Life to all men, and of withholding, from such a vast majority of men, the indispensable means of turning to any account of salvation the Life they have received from Heaven.

The Sacrament of Baptism has not the place, in the scheme of Dr. Craik, which is assigned it in the offices of our Church, accordant as we believe those offices to be with the teachings of the Catholic Church from the first, and with Holy Scripture. With Dr. Craik, the Rev. F. W. Robertson agrees in his sermons on Baptism and on its relation to the Christian Life. In their view

Baptism is our incorporation with the Church, and our adoption into the family of God. It is not the beginning of the Christian life, but the sign and declaration of a life already begun and imparted by the Incarnation. It is our New Birth into the Kingdom of God, but not the commencement of life, any more than our Natural Birth is the commencement of life, for there was life before Birth. Upon this distinction Dr. Craik much insists, and would thus seem to indicate the character of that life, which all men, he says, receive from Christ by virtue of the Incarnation.

But to recur to the analogy, if it be true that there cannot be birth without precedent antenatal life, it is equally true that that blind and hidden stirring of life in the depths of the womb, is never so regarded as the beginning of our natural life, that Birth is not treated and regarded as our introduction to what is properly and in correctest use of language, the life of man, and not till Birth, is the Life reckoned to commence, and, similarly, as the judicious Hooker hath it, "We are not Christian men," that is, partakers of the Divine Life in Christ, "in the eye of the Church of God, but by new Birth, nor according to the manifest, ordinary course of Divine Dispensation, new born, but by that Baptism which both declareth and maketh us Christians," so that Baptism is "the first apparent beginning of life," (or, as St. Basil has it, from whom Hooker borrows his expression, "Baptism is to me the beginning of life,") "a seal" to grace "before received," "but to our sanctification here, a step that hath not any before it."

Such is the truth stated in Scripture and in the teaching of the Catholic Church, and so Baptism is the revealed Beginning of our Life in Christ; of which sanctification is the development, and not itself a progressive step in the life conferred by the sanctifying Spirit, already begun.

The very interpretations, which those give to the formularies of the Church, who hold the latter view, is sufficient to show that it is not the Doctrine of Baptism incorporated with those formularies. Thus Mr. Robertson says:

"The Catechism, however, says: In Baptism * * * * I was *made* a child of God. Yes; coronation makes a sovereign; but paradoxical as it may seem, it can only *make* a sovereign one who is sovereign already. Crown a Pretender; that coronation will not create the King." "Coronation is the authoritative act of the Nation declaring a fact which was fact before."

* * * * * "Similarly with Baptism. Baptism makes a child of God in the state in which coronation makes a King. And Baptism naturally stands in Scripture for the title of Regeneration and the moment of it. Only what coronation is in an earthly way, an authoritative manifestation of an invisible earthly truth, Baptism is in a heavenly way—God's authoritative declaration in material form of a spiritual reality. In other words, no bare sign, but a Divine Sacrament."

That is an inimitable piece of exposition, surely both of Scripture and of the Catechism; of the Catechism, which says, moreover, "for being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, we are *hereby made* the children of grace,"—which teaches the child to say, "*Wherein* I was *made* a member of Christ;" and surely none are partakers of the Christ to be in them the fountain of their new life unto God, who are not "*members* of Christ." *This* Life is communicated in and through His Body, "for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body." And in the Baptismal office we are called upon to pray to God for the baptized, immediately upon the reception of the Holy Sacrament, "that they may lead the rest of their life according to this beginning,"—beginning of *what* we are fain to ask, if the sacrament and covenant of Baptism is not plainly here represented to be the beginning of our Christian life?

But if the Life of God conferred upon all men, according to these theories of Mr. Robertson and Dr. Craik, by the Incarnation or coming of Christ, be akin to the blind and hidden life that precedes birth, it would be little indeed accomplished for every man by the Incarnation, for the life of the womb, unless it comes to the birth, is not worthy of being counted life at all, and the New Birth, which comes through Christ, comes, according to the way of His revelation and appointment, by His Sacrament of Baptism, and hence the command to evangelize all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, thus uniting them in Christ's appointed way to Him, who is the Life and Light of men.

To maintain His commission intact, to follow it out as the ordained way of dispensing to all, who will receive it, the gift, which He, in His Universal Redemption, has provided for all, is the primal obligation of His Holy Church; and to make men members of Christ, in His Body the Church, and then to nourish

and strengthen them into the full development of the Christian life, the life, which is hid in the Christ, in God, is the appointed office of the Church, in the ministration of His Gospel, and so is His Incarnation to be applied to that purpose of the salvation of men for which He became Incarnate.

So proceeding, we are on the clear and firm ground of Divine Revelation. What God may do for those to whom Christ is not preached, among whom His Church is unknown, we have no clear ground of Revelation for determining. We may and must believe that He will deal, in justice and mercy, with all the sons of men; that the Spirit may move upon the hearts of men in the depths of Heathendom; that God will recognize every act, and thought of goodness, which is the fruit of His Spirit; we may fancy moreover, if so we are disposed, that, to those, who have not heard a preached Gospel amid these scenes of time, it may be preached in another scene of their existence; but for all such speculations, beliefs, or opinions, we can find no announcements of Divine Revelation.

But that the Gospel has been put in commission by the Incarnate Son of God, that it may be preached to all Nations, and that all, who receive Him so presented as a Divine and Personal Saviour, may obtain from Him power to become the Sons of God, this should ever stimulate us, in our vocation and Ministry in His Holy Church "to make known His way upon earth, His saving health among all nations."

ART. V.—THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

1. *Handbook of the River Plate, comprising Buenos Ayres, the Upper Provinces, Banda Oriental, and Paraguay. By M. G. and E. T. Mulhall, Editors of the Standard. In two volumes. Buenos Ayres,* 1869.
2. *Pioneering in the Pampas, or the First Four Years of a Settler's Experience in the La Plata Camps. By Richard Arthur Seymour. With a Map.* 12*mo. London, Longmans, Green & Co.,* 1869.
3. *Description Géographique et Statistique de la Confédération Argentine. Par V. Martin de Moussy, Docteur en Médecine, etc.* 3 *vols.,* 8*vo. With Atlas. Paris, Didot Frères,* 1860.

4. *Writings of President Sarmiento, viz:*
   Life in the Argentine Republic, translated by Mrs. Horace Mann. 12mo. *New York,* 1868.
   De la Educacion Popular. 8vo. *Santiago,* 1849.
   Recuendos de Provincia. 8vo. *Santiago,* 1850.
   Viages en Europa, Africa i America. 2 vols., 8vo.; 2d Edition. *Santiago,* 1851.
   Las Escuelas. 8vo. *New York,* 1866.
   Observaciones con que al Poder Ejècutivo devuelve al Congress los Proyectos de Ley sobre Intervencion. Pamphlet. Buenos Ayres, 1869.
   Discurso del Presidente de la Republica al Cevrar las Sesiones del Congreso, &c., en Octubre de 1869. *Pamphlet. Buenos Ayres,* 1869.
5. *De la Instruccion Primaria en Chile. Por Miguel Luis i Gregoris Victor Amunatequi. Obra Premiada por el Gobierno de Chile.* 8vo. *Santiago,* 1856.
6. *Lectures Sobre la Educacion, por Horacio Mann. Vertidas al Castellano por Juana Manso.* 8vo. *Buenos Ayres,* 1868.

NEARLY half a century has elapsed since the Spanish States of South America achieved their independence of the mother country. The war for its attainment, resembling in its object that by which our own national existence had been won, attracted general sympathy among us; and the new States were welcomed into the family of nations by the acclamations of our people, responsive to the eloquence of Henry Clay. For a time, the interest in these young neighbors was increased by their adoption of republican institutions. But soon it appeared that their republicanism was more in name than in reality. They had copied our form of government, but they had not pursued the long and varied path by which we had attained it. To us, the election of representatives, and acquiescence in their legislation, had been familiar for ages; to the Spanish and Indian inhabitants of South America these were novelties, which neither reasoning nor habit had taught them to defend as rights, nor to observe as duties. In the new republics, therefore, elections were decided as frequently by the sword as by the ballot. The civil war, which had just closed, had left numbers of ambitious soldiers to become aspirants for office; and even if their ambition was tempered by patriotic intentions, they were in many cases too ignorant to know the true

method by which these should be carried into effect. In every political rival they saw, not an opponent to be outvoted, but an enemy to be subdued; and neither leaders nor followers thought of waiting for the day of election, when they had arms in their hands. Their republicanism was but sufficient to prevent any successful leader from acquiring in the public mind, "that divinity that doth hedge a King." Each successive ruler was but a President, and a President by an election so irregular, as to furnish a pretence for insurrection to whoever was dissatisfied with his measures, or ambitious for his place. Thus, whatever may have been the ability and integrity which labored to bring order out of the chaos, yet to the view of distant spectators, like ourselves, South America appeared the scene of constant rebellious revolutions and usurpations. After the first great man, the Liberator, Bolivar, there seemed, as Wordsworth said of revolutionary Fame,

> "Perpetual emptiness, unceasing change!
> No single volume paramount, no code,
> No master spirit, no determined road,
> But equally a want of books and men."

Probably in our distant survey of so wide a field, we failed to do justice to the true and enlightened patriots, such men as San Martin and Rivadavia. Under the guidance of these, and warned rather than guided by the dread light of revolutionary times, as by the glare of the volcanoes of their own Andes, arose a second generation, more familiar than their predecessors with the idea of the republic, and better qualified to fulfil the duties which that idea imposes.

Of the books whose titles we have given, the first is a book published in Buenos Ayres for the information of immigrants, and of those especially,—British subjects,—who are disposed to settle in South America. The first volume is devoted to the Argentine Republic; the same country will furnish the subject in part of the second volume; the remainder being occupied with Uruguay, or the Banda Oriental ("Eastern shore" of the La Plata) and Paraguay. The population of the Argentine Republic, we are told, exceeds a million and a half; the country, mostly an immense plain, is divided into fourteen provinces, of which that of Buenos Ayres is by far the wealthiest and most populous, while Entre Rios, Cor-

dova and San Juan, are among the other most advanced States. The natural advantages of the country are described in strong terms.

"There is, probably, no country on the face of the earth so favored by nature; being entirely situated in the South temperate zone, it enjoys a delightful climate, and the soil is so varied and fertile that it produces almost spontaneously all the great staples of home consumption and foreign commerce. Cotton, wheat, tobacco, yerba-maté (Paraguay tea,) cochineal, wine, coffee, silk, sugar, wool, and fruits of every kind may be raised of a superior quality, and in such abundance as to supply less-favored nations. The mineral resources of the country are hardly less important: coffee, silver, lead, salt, marble, limestone, granite, and coal are found in various places, and only require proper management and improved means of transit to become sources of national wealth. The country is, moreover, magnificently wooded and watered: the Gran Chaco (the wild country on the west of Paraguay,) possesses more timber, suitable for every purpose, than the whole of Europe, and the number and extent of navigable rivers are quite equal to the natural greatness and future requirements of a republic, destined one day to rival the Colossus of North America."

These great resources are, however, comparatively undeveloped.

"There is a sad contrast between what La Plata might be, and what it actually is. It does not export one bale of cotton; its tobacco is unknown; rice is a foreign commodity; yerba-maté, from Brazil, excludes that from Corrientes; cochineal abounds in Oran, but is not worth the freight; Mendoza wine has no market, for the same reason; coffee is considered too troublesome; the spiders of Corrientes weave a fine silk, which no one thinks of gathering; sugar is hardly cultivated; fruits are unprized, and our export returns show but three great staples in the Republic,—wool, hides, and tallow." (*Hand-book*, page 4.)

The government of the Republic directs its attention to the development of native industry; but for its future progress, the country looks also to the influx of foreigners, attracted by its fertile soil and temperate climate. Already immigration has taken place to an extent which promises well for the future. The new settlers are of various nations.

"The foreign population of the Province of Buenos Ayres is estimated at 250,000, distributed as follows: Italians, 70,000; Basques, 40,000; French, 30,000; Spaniards, 30,000; Irish, 30,000; English and Scotch, 10,000; Germans, 10,000; other nationalities, 30,000. This large number of foreigners, forming half the population of the Province of Buenos Ayres, is remarkable; and the foreigner, upon landing, is agreeably astonished to find himself in the midst of a large society of his countrymen. Amongst Argentines

of the respectable classes, proficiency in foreign languages is considered a necessary qualification; thus, the greater part of the merchants speak English or French." (Page 14.)

The following extract relates to the natives of that wonderful little island, which seems capable of filling the rest of the world without emptying itself.

"The Irish, though exercising little or no weight in public matters, may contend with any other nationality in point of usefulness."

"To them is due the great development of sheep-farming, which makes this country rival Australia in the growth of wool. The Irish farmers are estimated to possess nearly 30,000,000 sheep; they are also, as farmers, the chief landed proprietors in Buenos Ayres, and very hospitable to strangers. The districts of Liyan, Mercedes, Pilar, Areco, Lobos, &c., are thickly settled with Irishmen, and each district has its own Irish clergyman. With one or two exceptions, the Irish settlers began life (within the last thirty years,) having no other capital than a spade or shovel. There is nothing in the country more admirable than the steady industry of these men, some of whom count their sheep by the hundred thousand, and have landed property of thousands of acres in extent. In the city there is a large number of Irish housemaids, who are remarkable for their uniform morality, honesty and good conduct." (Page 15.)

Of the general spirit of the book before us, the following advice to immigrants presents a good example.

"New arrivals should be careful about roaming through the streets after 11 P. M., although the city is more quiet and orderly than most large towns. Above all things, beware of intoxication, and keep out of the Policia. In the coffee-houses, never make any offensive remarks about the country; it would be ill-breeding, and many of those around you are sure to understand English. If you meet a religious procession, either turn into the next street, or take off your hat and stand till it passes by. If any one ask you for a light for his cigar, present yours to him politely. Remember, always, that politeness and equality are the rule of the country, and act up to it." (Page 168.)

The little book, called "Pioneering in the Pampas," presents the experience of an English settler, during four years' residence in the country. The result of that experience, as summed up in the last few pages, is such as might be expected from a man of industry and spirit, settling in a country of great natural advantages, but where all was new, and public affairs in an unsettled condition. The location of the party was near Frayle Muerto, in the Province of Cordova, and about three hundred miles from Buenos Ayres.

"Notwithstanding our losses and discouragements, I see no reason to despair of our success; and, *provided*, the Government will defend their frontiers from the Indians, I can still encourage others to come and settle in our neighborhood. Where will they find pastures of so fine quality to be purchased at so low a price; with a fine climate, and many of their fellow-countrymen within easy reach; with a line of railroad, too, about thirty miles off, and a post, by four mails, monthly to England, of five weeks only from our little town to London? All that is wanted is our protection from the Indians. We have shown our trust in the Government by staking our fortunes in their country. We believe, that with the return of peace they will think it their plain duty to grant us this protection. We have great confidence in the newly-elected President, Señor Sarmiento, and we cannot believe, that with the power to help us, he will do us the injustice to leave us longer in our helpless condition." ("*Pioneering in the Pampas*," page 180.)

The "Description" by De Moussy is a work of higher scientific character. It is the result of a residence of eighteen years in the region of the La Plata, the author having gone thither under the patronage of the French government, and having undertaken this especial work at the instance of the Argentine authorities. The task was indeed, as it is well expressed, "to construct a sort of general encyclopædia of the Rio de la Plata;" and in its execution, while the author speaks modestly of his success, it has certainly been highly honorable to himself, and advantageous to those interested in the countries he describes. The book is dedicated to General Urquiza, President of the Republic at the time of its publication; and the author manifests repeatedly his admiration of that distinguished man. At present, Urquiza, though still exercising a commanding influence in his own province of Entre Rios, is withdrawn from the control of national affairs. The fall of his administration was hastened by errors of his own, as well as by the excited state of the country he ruled, and the immature condition of its institutions; but notwithstanding this, his name will occupy an honorable place in the history of his country, as the leader of her rescue from the tyranny of Rosas.

To Señor Sarmiento, now President of the Argentine Republic, we are indebted for the works which come next upon our list; the first originally, like the others, published in Spanish, but presented in the English language, and enriched with a memoir of its author, by the honored widow of one who "being dead, yet speaketh," through the influence of his example and teaching on this

South American statesman. In this book, contrary to the common arrangement, the Life of the author is placed after his own work; and it is best so; for the reader could not understand the influences which surrounded President Sarmiento in early life, the difficulties and dangers he encountered, and the task which has been and still is before him, without the knowledge of his country's calamitous history. Before, therefore, we speak of him individually, we will present, from his own writings and from other sources, a brief account of the political changes which preceded his appearance as a prominent soldier and statesman.

The government of Spain over her colonies was marked, it is well known, by narrow jealousy and careful suppression of whatever might give them independent importance. Yet the revolution, which separated them from Spain, began, at least in the instance of Buenos Ayres, in the interest of Spanish loyalty. The Viceroy Liniers, though himself a Frenchman, sent back the messenger who brought him orders in the name of Joseph Bonaparte, and for a time it appeared that the province would be faithful to the endangered throne of Ferdinand VII. But there was little in Ferdinand or his family, to win the love of his distant subjects; there was no power to enforce their obedience; and the people of Buenos Ayres, having exercised their freedom in choosing their sovereign, soon exercised it again in rejecting him. On the ninth of July, 1816, the independence of the province was declared by the Congress assembled at Tucuman.

But revolutions beget revolutions. If Buenos Ayres could revolt against Spain, Montevideo could as well revolt against Buenos Ayres. It was subdued, but dissension broke out among the victors. Rondeau, the Supreme Director of Buenos Ayres, was opposed, and at length beaten and displaced by Artigas, who had made himself master of Montevideo. In this man came into view the first of a class, beneath whose ignorant ferocity the region of the La Plata was destined long to suffer, the "caudillos" or chiefs of the wild cavalry of the pampas.

It would be tedious and unprofitable to trace all the ephemeral changes of the government, of which there were twenty in the fifteen months preceding February, 1821. Two parties soon became marked, exhibiting those tendencies with which we are familiar here, the centripetal and the centrifugal. Those who desired the

unity of the country under a strong central government were known as Unitarios, and those who preferred a federation among provinces otherwise independent, took the name of Federalistas. The strength of the former lay in the cities, especially in Buenos Ayres; and it ranked among its members most of the cultivated classes, to whom law and order were more attractive than unlimited freedom. On the other hand, the Federal party, its name meaning precisely the opposite to what it did in the United States, included the greater part of the country population, jealous of the ascendancy of the capital, and strangers to its manners. The employment of these people being chiefly the raising of cattle, their life was to a great extent nomadic. Their young men, almost living on horse-back, formed a wild cavalry militia, under such leaders as strength and speed, boldness in action and a rough heartiness of manner entitled to rule over them.

In 1826, the Unitarios were in power, under the Presidency of Rivadavia; but unable to carry out his measures, he resigned, and the Federalists gained the ascendancy. The interior provinces suffered under the tyranny of such partisan leaders as Facundo Quiroga and the Monk Aldao, both born to scourge mankind, but the latter a revolting compound of sensuality and cruelty, with military talent, the ineffaceable mask of the clerical profession adding to the whole a ghastly stain. The doctors of Cordova disputed learnedly whether a wafer, which this wretch consecrated for himself, when abject fear had driven him back to the exercise of his early office, had indeed become the body of the Lord. A far nobler leader of the Federalists was Dorrego, who held sway at Buenos Ayres; and it was in an evil hour for his country and for his own fame, that Lavalle, who wrested his power from him, caused him to be put to death. After long struggles, the rule remained in the hands of Juan Manuel Rosas, who had been manager of estates for the Dorrego Family. This man, while he compelled his countrymen to wear the motto, "Death to the savage Unitarios," went far beyond that party in ferocity, while he deserted the principles of his own by concentrating all power in the State of Buenos Ayres. He deprived the other provinces of all freedom of commerce, made barbarism triumphant over civilization in the capital, and in a stormy rule of fifteen years, sacrificed numbers of the best citizens to his ambition and revenge. Mean-

time, the Unitarios party, with its old ideas of entire centralization, had ceased to exist; but in its place was formed one composed of those who detested the tyranny of Rosas, and wished to see their country reorganized as a true confederate republic, in which the centripetal and centrifugal forces should be rightly balanced, on the model of the United States. Of those who held such views, many were in exile; and of these, the chief place of refuge was Montevideo, the capital of Uruguay in the Oriental Republic, with which Rosas was at war.

In the mean time, the province of Entre Rios, ("between the rivers," Parana and Uruguay,) had advanced in prosperity and civilization under the firm and enlightened government of Don Jose Urquiza. While rendering important services in the war waged by the Dictator Rosas as chief of the nation, Urquiza had welcomed to his province political refugees from the tyranny that reigned at Buenos Ayres. At length, the pretensions of Rosas to absolute power, and his persistent refusal to call a general Congress of the provinces, aroused the Governor of Entre Rios to decided action. He formed an alliance with Brazil and with Uruguay; the province withdrew the powers it had entrusted to the Dictator; the neighboring province of Corrientes united in the effort; and Sarmiento, and other noble exiles, hastened to place themselves under the banner of Urquiza.

The first undertaking of that chief was to raise the siege of Montevideo. In this he was at once successful, being hailed as a mediator by all parties in Uruguay. Oribe, Rosas' lieutenant, unable to resist, submitted to terms, by which the Argentine army under his command was transferred to that of Urquiza, who thus closed in three months, without shedding a drop of blood, a war of ten years duration. In the treaty of peace, the successful general inserted the words, "There are among the Orientals neither conquerors nor conquered."

The army now, aided by the Brazilian fleet, advanced to the deliverance of Buenos Ayres. At the battle of Monte Caseros, February 3d, 1852, where 25,000 men were engaged on each side, the troops of the Dictator after some hours' fighting, laid down their arms, and Rosas himself fled in disguise, and found refuge on board a British vessel. In this battle, Domingo Sarmiento, who had come from his long exile to take part in the deliverance of

his country, served as Colonel and Chief of the staff; and, after the contest, had the satisfaction of writing the bulletin which proclaimed to the world the fall of Rosas, "upon the tyrant's own table, with the tyrant's own pen." (*Life in the Argentine Republic*, page 359.)

We must now pause in our record of events, to give an account of the earlier history of this eminent man, who now holds the presidency of the Republic.

Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, was born in 1811, in San Juan, the capital of the province of the same name, lying near the base of the Andes. His family was of good descent, but in very reduced circumstances; his father had been brought up to manual labor, but despising it, declared, that his son should never handle a spade, and "passed his whole life in beginning speculations whose products were scattered in badly counselled moments." The standing of the family, however, and the character of the boy, were saved by the energy and prudence of the mother. The youth received in his native place the instructions of a teacher, of whom he spoke in later life with affectionate respect; and afterwards at San Luis, those of his uncle, the clergyman, Don Josè de Oro. Returning home, he became apprentice in a store, but his love of study continued, and his spare moments were given to reading. His books were well selected; but a lady who saw him busy with them, day after day, as she passed the shop, remarked, with a shake of her head, "That lad cannot be good; if those books were good, he would not read them so eagerly."

At sixteen, being then ensign of militia, a defiance, more spirited than wise, of what he considered unjust authority, occasioned his imprisonment. Shortly after, he enlisted with the Unitarios in an insurrection against Facundo Quiroga, and was soon engaged in the excitement and the perils of civil war. Obliged to conceal himself during the ascendancy of the murderous Friar Aldao, he improved his leisure by studying French. Afterwards he escaped to Chili, where he in succession taught school, kept shop, and superintended the working of a mine, borrowing hours meanwhile from the night to study English.

In 1836, he returned to San Juan, with health, bodily and mental, impaired by over-work. He soon, however, took an active part in measures for the advancement of education and the spread

of intelligence. A periodical which he established, drew upon him the persecution of the government. Narrowly escaping with life, he was sent into exile; but before he went wrote on a wall with a piece of charcoal his farewell, in the words, "*On ne tue pas les idées!*"

Again taking refuge in Chili, he was received with respect and cordiality by the government of that country, and conducted for a time a public journal. In 1841, however, when an insurrection had been organized against the tyranny of Rosas, he set out on his return, to join his fellow-patriots. With labor and danger he had crossed the Andes, when "he and his little party saw afar off, like blots upon the interminable wastes of snow, groups of fleeing soldiers." Their partisans had been defeated by the government forces, and the fugitives must be assisted promptly, or hundreds would perish. Instantly Sarmiento recrossed the mountains, running down their western side without resting from his ascent; he despatched laborers to the aid of his countrymen, wrote to the Chilian government, and to all to whom he could individually appeal for aid, and sent an article to the paper he had lately conducted, to awaken the compassion of the country. His efforts were not in vain. "In three days, sufficient food, medicines, physicians, etc., etc., for a thousand men, were on their way over the giant heights." (Page 344.)

He now resumed his newspaper, and by its means, brought before the minds of the Chilian people the importance of general education. He suggested the new idea of common schools supported by taxation; he prepared and published school-books; and, in 1842, "founded the first Normal School that was opened on this side of the Atlantic;" which for three years, he personally directed. His efforts met with opposition, such as noble efforts always encounter; and it well nigh deprived him of reason; but he was sustained and restrained, saved from others and from himself, by the constant friendship and wise forbearance of the minister, Don Manuel Montt, and other noble Chilians. By the advice and influence of these, he was commissioned by the Chilian government to visit other countries for the purpose of observing their educational institutions. Leaving Chili about the end of the year 1845, he visited the principal countries of Europe, conferring everywhere with distinguished men and making extensive observa-

tions. In England he read a reprint of Horace Mann's Report of his educational tour in Europe; and afterwards visiting the United States, sought out the author, and formed with him that friendship to which we are indebted for the labor of Mrs. Mann upon the volume before us. He then returned to Chili, and devoted himself again to literary labor, for the good of his adopted country, and of that from which he was still an exile.

He now published his travels (viajes), and his report upon Popular Education. The former of these is written in a lively style, and gives minute accounts of many interesting incidents of travel. The report (De la Educacion Popular) contains full accounts of his observations in Europe and the United States, arranged under the heads of The School Tax, (La Renta), Inspection of Public Schools, The Education of Women, Teachers, Infant Schools, (Salas de Asilo), Public Schools, System of Teaching, and Spanish Orthography. The work closes with the Bill respecting Education, introduced into the Legislature of Chili, in August, 1849, by Don Manuel Montt, as the result of the information collected by his friend.

In 1850 appeared the "Country Recollections," (Recuerdos de Provincia,) a work of autobiography and family history, which cannot be fully understood nor justified without reference to the circumstances under which it was written. The author was in exile from his native land; and though enjoying the home and friends that his character and talents had gained him in Chili, he was the object of constant abuse on the part of the government of Rosas at Buenos Ayres. He says himself that in thirty official notes which had been published, his name had appeared with such epithets as infamous, unclean, vile and savage. To such abuse he replied by exhibiting the record of his life, by unveiling the humble, but pure and virtuous home from which he sprung, by tracing his genealogy to names honored in the past, and by recounting the acts of manly effort and patriotic devotion, which had gained him the hostility of the oppressors of his country. From this book is derived the charming account, in his Memoir by Mrs. Mann, of the home in San Juan,—of the mother who presided there, with her constant industry and her honorable pride in poverty,—and of the amusing contest between the spirit of improvement and the memory

of the past, in deciding upon the fate of the two old pictures in the parlor, and of the old fig-tree in the garden.

At length the hour of deliverance struck. Sarmiento, with other Argentine refugees in Chili, made the voyage around Cape Horn to join the army of Urquiza, and took, as we have seen, a distinguished part in the operations which resulted in the expulsion of the tyrant Rosas.

It is too often the case that he who has done service to his country by expelling a despotic ruler, desires himself to be the despot. At least the suspicion of such a purpose is almost of necessity incurred, for a nation at such a crisis requires the guidance of a strong hand; and a strong government is readily charged with criminal ambition. Such a charge was soon made against General Urquiza; and was the more credited in Buenos Ayres, because that province found itself reduced to an equality with the others, which it had lately ruled. The result was that Buenos Ayres separated itself from the confederacy. The other provinces reorganized the constitution which Rosas had overthrown, and elected Urquiza as the first constitutional president.

Sarmiento, after an impressive warning to Urquiza, of the consequences of the course which he thought that chief was pursuing, withdrew from public affairs, and returned to Chili. He afterwards took up his residence in Buenos Ayres, assumed the editorship of the "Nacional," and labored to advance the cause of education in that province. His views were aided by the publication by the Chilian Government, in 1856, of the volume on Primary Instruction, a prize essay, which, though bearing other names, is so much the result of his labors that it may be regarded as substantially his work. In 1857, he was appointed Director of the Schools of Buenos Ayres, and was also made Councillor of the Municipality. After many difficulties and much opposition encountered, he succeeded in the establishment of schools after the model of the best in this country. A beautiful building was erected, for a Model School, and provided with furniture and apparatus from the United States; and before long, seventeen thousand children were receiving public instruction in the city. Being now elected senator of the province, he procured the erection, at public expense, of other school-houses throughout its territory, and the adoption of other measures of reform and improvement. Under his superin-

tendence and through his efforts, in five years, not less than seventy schools were established.

Urquiza now undertook the forcible reunion of Buenos Ayres with the Argentine Confederacy.

Having defeated General Mitré at Cepeda, he advanced on the city. The Senate were saved from making peace on degrading conditions, by the firmness and eloquence of Sarmiento; but the object of reunion was accomplished, and the reconciled patriots embraced each other in the presence of thousands of their countrymen. Only a year after, however, disturbances again took place, and Urquiza was defeated on the banks of the Pavon by Mitré, who thereupon succeeded him in the presidency.

This last contest had been connected with civil commotions in San Juan; and after the action at Pavon, Sarmiento was placed in command of the force sent for the pacification of his native province. He entered it, after twenty-two years of exile, at the head of a victorious army. His arrival was hailed with joy; he was elected Governor of the province; and by successful military operations combined with wise civil government, put down the disturbers of order, and restored prosperity to the home of his youth. He initiated at San Juan improvements similar to those he had introduced at Buenos Ayres. In 1864, he laid, in his native city the foundation of a noble edifice, the "Sarmiento School." In the erection of this, the whole community joined, "some by the produce of their farms and other labors, the ladies by theatrical exhibitions, concerts, fairs, and many liberal men by their money. It was erected within the ruins of an abandoned Church." (*Life in the Argentine Republic*, page 311. Note.) He soon after resigned the office of Governor of San Juan, to serve his country as its representative to the governments of Chili, Peru, and the United States.

While minister to this country, Col. Sarmiento wrote for his own people, his "Life of Abraham Lincoln," and "The Schools, the Basis of the Prosperity of the United States." This work, though in the Spanish language, was printed in New York; but nearly the whole edition, of a thousand copies, was destroyed by fire, while stored in the Government House at Buenos Ayres. We have before us one of the few copies which escaped the flames. We recognize in its frontispiece the well-known statue of Horace Mann, as it stands in front of the State House of Massachusetts; and

among its leading contents we find a life of that distinguished philanthropist, a full account of the session of the American Institute of Instruction, in August, 1865, and notices of the "Freedmen's Aid Society," and of schools for the instruction of the people of color.

In General Mitré, who succeeded Urquiza, the Republic possessed a President of literary accomplishments, as shown in his "Life of Belgrano," of military skill, and of attractive personal qualities. The greatest trial which the country endured during his administration was that of the Paraguayan war. This contest, however, in which the President, at one period, commanded the allied forces, had at least the good effect of removing to a distant scene some of those fiery spirits whose presence at home might have led to new disturbances. Some such indeed took place; and the frontiers, left comparatively unprotected by the withdrawal of the army for distant service, were harassed by incursions of the Indians. President Mitré, however, retained his power through the term for which he had been chosen; and at its close, gave way to his successor by an orderly election.

It was while residing here as Minister of the Argentine Republic, that Col. Sarmiento received the high distinction of being elected to its Presidency. On his return to enter upon that office, which he now holds, he found his country engaged in the war already spoken of—a strife in which he has had cause to mourn the death of his only son, a youth of unusual promise. The new President was not responsible for that strife; but he considered the course his country had adopted to be just and necessary; and he has maintained with good faith the obligations which had been contracted towards her allies, Brazil and Uruguay. His government, at home, has not been without that opposition which every energetic and upright ruler must encounter; but thus far he has been sustained by the well-won confidence of his fellow-citizens.

President Sarmiento had not been long in office, when he was called on for the exercise of that firm control, which is as much the duty of a magistrate in a republic as in a monarchy. The Governor of one of the Provinces had, in the spirit of those ruder times when the will of a Quiroga, or an Aldao, was the law of the land, imprisoned the Legislature, because they would not accept an ordinance of his, prescribing the mode of election. The Con-

stitution, as in the United States, guaranteed a republican government to every Province; and in conformity with this provision, the President reversed the action of the provisional despot, and set free his prisoners. The action in itself was too evidently just and right to be directly censured; but the opposition felt or affected alarm at the interference of the general government with that of a province; and two "projects of laws" were passed by the National Congress, and submitted to the President for his signature, confining within narrow limits the right of such intervention. His reply which is given in one of the Pamphlets before us, is alike courteous, calm and forcible. He assigns his reasons for refusing to sanction the proposed restrictions. The rights of the Executive he says, are to be defined, not by a coördinate branch of the Government, but by the Constitution alone; nor would it be right to limit, by strict enactment a power whose exercise might be required on a sudden emergency, and under circumstances which could not be foreseen. His firmness prevailed, and the Congress, relinquishing its ill-advised action, left unimpaired to the Chief Magistrate the power of protecting life and liberty from provincial tyrants.

Of the state of education in South America, and especially in the Argentine Republic, we have, in the volumes before us, and in letters of President Sarmiento, which we have been permitted to read, accounts strangely blended, of destitution, and of hopeful, but irregular progress. In Chili, as late as 1832, we are told a criminal was condemned to teach school, as he might have been to labor on the public works. (*Life in the Argentine Republic*, page 348—note.) The census of 1854, in the same country, gave a population of 1,439,120, of whom 1,255,222 were unable to read. In the public and private schools there were then 28,822 children; a small proportion to 606,810, the number given as below the age of fifteen. (*De la Instruccion Primaria*, page 271.) These figures are not encouraging; but the same volume from which they are taken,—itself a proof of the interest felt in education among the governing class in the republic—gives us the following anecdote, indicating the spirit which influences some devoted teachers, and the success which such a spirit must attain.

"A league from the city of Los Andes rises a group of houses around a chapel. This little place is known by the name of San Rafael. The municipality of the department determined, in 1853, upon the establishment of a school at this point, and named a young man, called Santos Torres, as its teacher, with a salary of twelve dollars a month. The school opened with a single pupil; and a month passed without the addition of any other. When the teacher came for his pay, the authorities exhibited dissatisfaction with the small result of the school. Torres, as if he took the blame on himself refused to receive a single real of his salary. Another month passed, and the pupils did not increase; the authorities resolved to close the school. The young teacher then asked permission to try a last effort to excite interest in the families around. The next Sunday he was present at the mass which was celebrated in the chapel of San Rafael. At the time when the faithful were retiring, he came forward into the midst of them and began to speak to them with the earnestness of conviction about the deserted school, the money spent upon it without result, the advantages of primary instruction, and the determination formed by the authorities to close the school if no more pupils came. The neighbors heard Torres with attention; at the invitation of the speaker they all went to visit the school-house. In it the young preceptor continued the exhortation he had commenced in the chapel. The parents were moved, and, in fact, more than thirty children were entered on the list of pupils. This was in the month of April; in August following, the municipal school of San Rafael counted sixty pupils, according to the bulletin of this month, sent to the office of Public Instruction."—(*De la Instruccion Primaria*, page 317.)

In the Argentine Republic, according to the statements of De Moussy (vol. II. pp. 633–635,) who left the country in 1859, there were in all the centres of population, primary schools, in which were taught reading, writing, and the elements of arithmetic and grammar, with lessons of a religious and moral character; a price being paid by those who were able to afford it. Schools of a higher grade in which Latin, French and English were taught, existed in the principal cities; and at the head of the system were the universities of Cordova and Buenos Ayres. By the efforts of Sarmiento and others, as we have in part seen, education has been made more directly a charge of the state, and numerous school-houses have been erected. We find in the "Hand-book" such statements as the following:

"San Fernando includes a number of fertile islands, in what is called the Delta of the Paraná. . . . . The inhabitants, of course, go about in boats, and there is a school, attended by one hundred children, who travel every day in the same manner."—(*Hand-book, Section C.*, page 23).

"San Andres de Giles is a poor little hamlet, with 950 inhabitants, almost stitute of trade or agriculture. . . . The Church is new, and there is a ate school, attended by thirty-eight boys and thirty-five girls."—(Page).

"Moron is one of the most important stations on the Western Railway, stant about fourteen miles west of the city of Buenos Ayres. . . . . The izgado (Court House) and free-schools are elegant and commodious public ildings."—(Pages 80–81).

"Mercedes . . . is one of the best towns in the camp (or colony, settled incipally by Irish immigrants). The State school was built in 1866. . . . has a fine front, supported by six Doric columns, and surmounted by a lustrade, with a dozen vases of terra-cotta; the boys' school is on the ght, and the girls' on the left, each accommodating two hundred pupils; e wings are respectively occupied by the master and mistress, and have ce suites of rooms. Sr. Maldonado has conducted the boys' school for ten ars, with the utmost satisfaction. It will agreeably surprise the stranger to d the State schools of this and the other camp-towns so comfortable and atly furnished, and the appearance of the children so orderly and respect- le." (Pages 94–95.)

On the other hand, President Sarmiento writes, under date of vember 12th, 1869.

What would you say if I should send you all that has been written to me the German Director of a College which I have had opened in ——. It 70,000 inhabitants, (Guichuas in origin and language,) and in the capi- the only city, eighty pupils of the white class who were presented by the families, were not prepared to receive lessons, from not knowing well igh how to read and write! All the professors have concluded to open imary school, and set to work to teach reading!"

This however is not unlike what sometimes happens in our stern States, where a grave theologian from the East, who has n complimented with the title of President of a College, finds his arrival at the scene of his learned labors, that no part of University is yet organized excepting the Preparatory school. Another part of the same letter is more encouraging. Of his ve city he writes:

In 1863, I found in San Juan 5000 children in the schools. This year report gives 5000; and as I offered a premium of $10,000 to the province ch should count one child in the schools for each ten inhabitants, San n undertook to obtain it, enrolling 7000 in those two months for 60,000 abitants, fulfilling the condition."

In a letter written shortly before, on the first anniversary of his uguration as President, Señor Sarmiento takes a brief survey of

the year that had passed; and while he speaks of difficulties and opposition encountered, he still manifests encouragement.

"The law for the creation of the Astronomical Observatory has finally passed;"—"All the projects of law which I have presented to a congress which had been previously formed, have been sanctioned, and are now laws, with the estimate of expenses as I presented them. The country is tranquil. Urquiza is with me, and all in appearance goes on well." "In matters of education I have succeeded sufficiently, and in many other respects I have no great reasons to be discontented." "I have two Normal schools in process of formation." "I hope to have another year of work, with more tranquility to consecrate myself to education."

At the same time the President addressed to the Congress his message of prorogation, which also lies before us. In this he congratulates his countrymen, as the first year of his administration closes, upon the general peace and prosperity, the virtual close of the Paraguayan war, the advancement of the great interests of education, and the unanimity of sentiment prevailing on all subjects of public importance. "The truth is," he says:

"That there is now no question on which a rational difference of opinion exists; no problem which seriously affects the public interests, agitates our minds; nothing of a personal character brings with it any consequence of importance." Under these favorable circumstances, he may well express the hope, that in the coming year they "may equally rejoice in new progress intellectual and material, and in the advance of the national institutions alike in spirit and in practice."

Among the means which President Sarmiento has employed to interest his people in education, has been the diffusion among them of the writings of the American Scholar in whose steps he has followed. Thus there have appeared, in the "Anals de la Educacion," published in Buenos Ayres, the "Lectures on Education" by Horace Mann, translated by Señora Manso. These are now in a separate volume, accompanied by President Sarmiento's Memoir of his friend.

In pursuance of his great object, the President has sought teachers, male and female, in the United States. Several have already sailed for Buenos Ayres; and an agent of the Government, authorized to employ others.

We trust that under the guidance of the remarkable man, whom his fellow-countrymen look up with a confidence as honorable

ble to themselves as it is to him, the Argentine Republic will continue rapidly its course of improvement. The Paraguayan war ended, and the name of the President honored in the neighboring states of Chili, Uruguay and Brazil, there is every ground to hope that the great Confederacy of the Southern Hemisphere may enjoy, for many years, that peace which is important alike for the development of its material resources, and for the advancement of its people in all that constitutes the true glory of a nation.

Art. VII.—S. ATHANASIUS THE GREAT.

The old world, which was dying in S. Athanasius' days, had one distinguished representative of its weakness and decay in Constantine's son, whom we are now to meet as the Emperor Constantius. He had, at first, only the East in his third of the Empire, but before long, he was sole Emperor, having inherited his father's vices, but not his greatness.

Arianism now became the fashion of the court, and it was not difficult to persuade the Emperor of the East that one word, and one man, its bigoted defender, were the causes of all contention; and Athanasius must, by any means, be put out of the way; deposed, it was said, by a council of the Church. He had returned to Alexandria while still bound by the sentence. A great Church was to be dedicated at Antioch with exceeding splendor. The imperial father had erected the Church, and the imperial son called a multitude of Bishops to the consecration. Ninety came. Antioch was the Arian centre, and the Eusebians flocked thither in great numbers. They must put forth a creed, since the *ὁμοούσιον* in that of Nice was an insuperable rock in their way. But that Creed was accepted throughout Christendom as the old and apostolic faith, and they could not openly attack it. *Ὁμοούσιος*, however, was not a "scriptural expression," so by ambiguous words they deceived the people who accepted their teachers for what they seemed to be, and kept the faith which those teachers had lost. At this time, therefore, even more directly than before, came up the question which is the ruling one throughout Athanasius' life, what a Christian man's faith truly is. The result of those Arian

and Eusebian efforts was that their little company at Antioch succeeded in making four Creeds. In the end they far exceeded that number. Leaving out the ὁμοούσιος as a needless cause of contention, they drew their creeds so much like the Nicene as to satisfy the people, while they explained its other expressions to satisfy themselves.

Very different is S. Athanasius' rest in a faith, once for all revealed, and then embodied in the Nicene Creed, to be the unchangeable trust of every Christian man; and very touching and eloquent is his explanation how any words could be used regarding such high mysteries. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"

"The more I endeavored to write and to force myself to understand the Divinity of the Eternal Word, so much the more did that knowledge escape me. When I thought that I apprehended it, I then perceived myself to fail of doing so. And what I seemed to understand, I could not express in words; and what I wrote was unequal to the imperfect shadow of the truth which was in my mind. * * * But lest I should disappoint you, and, by my silence, lead others wrong who are given to disputation, I have written briefly. *For although it is impossible to comprehend what God is, yet it is possible to say what He is not;* and to condemn the assertion of the wicked, and say, that he is not such."

Athanasius' days of peace, with which our last Article concluded, were very few. Not three years passed before he was surrounded by darkness and storms from which he rarely emerged, and only for a little while, until perpetual light was almost ready to dawn upon him.

If it was in A. D. 338 that he returned to Alexandria, and if, as is probable, he made two voyages to Italy about this time, it was in A. D. 339 he set sail for Rome. For such was the state of things under Constantius, that he had no hope of any fair judgment in the East. But under a more equitable ruler of the West, and with a Bishop of Rome disposed towards justice, there was more expectation of an impartial hearing.

New charges had been heaped upon the old. One wearies of hearing them. Yet how can we otherwise appreciate our Bishop's position? The gift of corn which the late Emperor had bestowed upon the widows of the second city of his Empire, had been kept, it was said by Athanasius for himself. And this was charged against

over whose remains that funeral eulogium was pronounced
h concluded our last Article, in the midst of weeping widows
orphans to whom he had ever been a father and a brother.
nother charge brings to our eyes one of the most glorious
is of light which illumine the Church of these days. Tender
merciful like her Lord, in the brief days of her triumph before
world, she sought no requital for her infinite wrongs. Let us
t of the horrors of the Diocletian Persecution; let us think
maimed, distorted forms made their way through the streets
lexandria; let us call to mind that Christian men had *human*
ts in these days, and then ask ourselves why no act of retalia-
was ever known. But the Eusebians felt what they would do
eir day of power, and thought all men like themselves. So
accused Athanasius of imprisoning and beating the Arians,
e cause they were everywhere making their own. And very
of Christian love is the answer of the Bishop of Egypt:

hains and death are *alien to the Spirit of our Church.* Athanasius never
d any, nor gave any one to the executioner. Our Churches are sancti-
y the blood of Christ alone."

he thread of Athanasius' life now becomes more and more tan-
. Unravelled, it seems to run thus. His hopes of a fair trial
Rome, before his accusers, were doomed to disappointment.
us of Rome sent to invite them to present their charges. The
espondence is not very edifying. They replied with some
ts, and, at last, refused to come on account of the *Persian*
r, some hundreds of miles removed from all of them. Com-
ts against themselves, on the other hand, came from every
rter. In Thrace, Syria, Phenicia, Palestine, Christians
excluded from their own Churches; their Bishops were
en into exile, scourged, or imprisoned and in chains. But the Eu-
ans had power on their side, and they were not disposed for any
before the Church; so, after waiting eighteen months, Atha-
us returned home. Only a year more, and that decree of ex-
ame, which we have already anticipated. Alexandria pre-
ed a strange scene. Some things there come out in strong relief,
help us to fancy it. Most are gone to God's hidden records,
re just distinguishable as in an old and defaced picture.
re is Gregory of Cappadocia, consecrated Bishop of Alexan-

dria, and sent with the apostate Philagrius, the Prefect, and some thousands of soldiers, to drive Athanasius out of Alexandria, and to seat himself, as Patriarch, in our Bishop's chair. Something of Gregory we can make out, and very characteristic it is. He was coarse, gross, without even the grace to cover his want of principle with a seemly mask. The day for these men was approaching. We can hardly fancy such a person taking a Bishop's place among us. We may lament the corruptions of our own days, but some things are certainly better than they were.

There was no law by which these ninety reverend Bishops at Antioch could send this Gregory to Alexandria, and, without the soldiers, he would have found some difficulty in reaching Athanasius' seat. But the Prefect of Egypt was an apostate Christian, and his heathen body-guard was at Gregory's service. His entry into Alexandria stands out somewhat conspicuously from the shades which cover most of the picture. The Christians saw that he had come from the Arians, and though he strung together some Scripture expressions in the form of a creed, the Alexandrians understood what he was. They crowded their Churches in greater number than ever. Gregory was likely to be a Bishop without Churches or people, except Jews, heathen, and the expelled Arians. So Philagrius, to make room for Gregory and his Arian friends, sent a mob, with swords, clubs and stones. They emptied the Churches. One, at least, was set on fire. Some persons were trampled under foot and perished; some were beaten senseless and died of their wounds; others were sold as slaves. The gentle, modest women, who gave their lives to works of charity, were seized, stripped, scourged, abused. Those were wild times for the low heathen rabble, who still secretly longed for the old days. They spoiled the Churches which Gregory gave up to be plundered. Some laid hold of the money which Christian people had deposited there for security. They helped themselves to the sacred vessels, the candlesticks, the costly metal doors or screens, the stores of oil and wine, the robes of the Clergy. They offered birds on the Christian Altars, and sang their old heathen songs where Christ had been adored. They burnt the Holy Scriptures, when they could find them. The people saw the fonts wherein their children had been baptized, turned to all manner of abominations by naked men.

f a fair opportunity offered itself for robbing a Christian, it was 'ell understood that the crime would have no severe judgment.

On one occasion—it was Good Friday—Gregory, with the Pre- ect, entered one of the Churches, where a few were praying. 'hey very naturally shrank away from him; and, on a hint from im to the Prefect, thirty-four of them, virgins, wives, Christian ien, some of rank, were scourged and thrust into loathsome dun- eons. The little alms which the widows and other pensioners of he Church had been receiving, Gregory kept for himself. Such 'ere a wolf's doings set over a flock of sheep to be their shep- erd.

The Christian people of Alexandria could not, would not endure iese ministers. So the Churches were left to the Arians. But ' their Clergy attempted to minister to them in private they were isulted, beaten and robbed. So the sick remained unassisted, and ied without the communion. S. Athanasius, in the hurried letter 'hich he dispatched to the Bishops of the Church throughout the 'orld, showed how this persecution from men calling themselves 'hristians surpassed those of the old heathen times: for then, in rivate at least, the priest might minister to his people.

Similar scenes were repeated throughout Egypt. Some Bishops 'ere scourged, and, in chains, cast into prison. Some might be een, feeble old men laboring, as prisoners at the public works. 'arapammon, who had earned love and reverence as a confessor i the old heathen persecution, was banished. Potammon, whom 'e saw at Nice, his eye lost in the Diocletian persecution, was courged until he lay as dead. Poor Christians nourished him as 'ell as they could; but he lingered between life and death or a few days only and then ended his pains.

This was in Lent and Easter-tide, A. D. 341. Constantine, the ounger, had been Athanasius' fast friend; but he was dead, and here was no one to shield the innocent. Alexandria was no place or Athanasius. He staid for some time concealed in the neigh- orhood, until he had done all he could do for his people. But Vestern Europe could offer him refuge for awhile. So we find im again at Rome. Fifty Bishops met there, and receiving all he documents, and hearing all the evidence, the Eusebians still efusing to appear, they pronounced Athanasius innocent.

One brother of Constantius still survived. He was perhaps no better than the others, but he was a friend to justice when it interfered with none of his plans. This was Constans. He summoned Athanasius to Milan, and was so well pleased with him that he resolved to undertake his defence.

On the Northern boundaries of Macedonia and Thrace, South of the Danube, lay the little town of Sardica. There once more the Bishops of the East and West were to meet and reconcile distracted Christendom. About equal numbers came from either quarter. The one hundred Western Bishops had not troubled themselves with logic or philosophy. Having believed in Christ, worshiped Him as God, and received the Nicene Creed as the old faith and its perpetual rule, they were satisfied. But grief and astonishment filled their honest souls at what the Eusebians were doing in the name of Religion. Like their modern representatives, while affecting the greatest liberality, they were seeking to drive out of the Church those only who held to a positive faith. Some who came to Sardica showed the chains with which the Eusebians had loaded them. Others had sent from their dungeons friends to present their complaints; others told of exiled Bishops dying in deserts, mountains and caves, from exposure, privation and hunger.

The seventy Bishops of the East, however, were chiefly Eusebians and Arians. As usual, they depended on the Court to carry them through their undertaking. Imperial commissioners came with them to overawe the poor Catholic Bishops. Yet these worthy politicians had no doubt that they would be in a minority, and settled all their plans upon the road to Sardica. They took care not to leave their Catholic companions alone, even at night. In the modern style they agreed not to be outvoted, but to secede and break up the Synod. Athanasius' case was, as usual, the test question. The recusants said that they could not sit in Synod with one who had been tried, condemned and deposed. But it had been spread abroad what kind of trial he had, and the western Bishops at once replied that he had been condemned in his absence. That availed nothing. The Eusebians renewed the old charges. They declared Julius of Rome, Hosius of Corduba and others, deposed. Good old Hosius tried a last effort. "If Athanasius can have a trial, and be proved guilty, we all will desert him. If he

hall be proved innocent, and still you will not receive him, I will ake him with me into Spain." All was in vain. The Eusebians ad news of Constantius' victory over the Persians, and they must asten home to congratulate him.

Constantius wrote in all directions to stop the letters which came rom Sardica, restoring the exiled Bishops. Alexandria's harbor 'as watched for fear any of the exiles should return that way. 'he Arians were very officious in the matter, but their care was uite needless, for the exiled Bishops were not in haste to entrust hemselves to such keeping.

This was in A. D., 347. The meeting of Sardica had plainly mounted to nothing. Constans however, wrote to his brother hat if he were wise he would allow our Bishop to return. If he rould not, the former had an army and a fleet which would be emloyed for the same purpose. There was trembling at Constantiople. Constantius consulted some of the Eastern Bishops, and hey thought it better that Athanasius should return than that here should be civil war. As weak as unprincipled, the Emperor f the East tried to smooth over these rough places. Athanasius nderstood him, and was more than a match for a host of such peole. Three times Constantius, with more and more pressing enreaties, summoned him to return. Very lamb-like were his words, reak and vile as he really was.

"Our benignant clemency will not suffer you any longer to be tempestossed by the wild waves of the sea. For our unwearied piety has not lost ight of you, while you have been bereft of your native home, deprived of our goods, and wandering in strange wildernesses."

After the experience which Athanasius had had, he naturally lemanded some guaranties before he put himself again into the ower of such men. Nor this alone. Orders also were sent into Egypt recalling the exiled Bishops who had not forsaken Athanasius. Then at last our Bishop returned. A joyful letter of congratulation from Julius of Rome to the people of Alexandria went along with him.

"Fire tries the precious metals, and proves them precious. So our dear rother goes back proved through many tribulations, and by the great counil pronounced innocent. What a day of joy will that be for you when he omes back! I feel it with you, for I too have known Athanasius."

Constantius himself kindly received him, wrote very complimentary letters to Alexandria, and ordered all records against him or any of his friends to be cancelled. "Let all in Alexandria be at peace, and follow their Bishop in holy and religious ways." This was from the camp of the Emperor at Antioch. Athanasius wished to meet his enemies in Constantius' presence. They, of course, were not willing; but they gave a hint to the Emperor. "It is not much," he says, "they ask, that you set apart, namely, one Church in Alexandria for the people who will not commune with you," *i. e.*, for the Arians. And shrewd, as usual, was the Bishop's response: "Who can deny your requests, since you have power to order what you will? But there is one thing I too ask." The Emperor promised that it should be done. "It is that in Antioch where there are so many who hold the old faith, you will give back to our people one of the Churches which the Arians have taken from them." A just request as the Emperor cannot but feel. But the Arians would not assent; so the question of Alexandria's Churches was settled.

Sixteen Bishops met at Jerusalem to welcome the Saint on his way home; and they too sent their congratulatory letter to Alexandria.

"Who ever dared to hope that his eyes should see the joyful day? Ye were as sheep scattered and fainting without a shepherd. But the true shepherd on high who ever cares for His sheep has heard your cries, and restored to you him you love."

Bishops Ursacius and Valens, two of that notorious commission from Tyre to hunt out some new charges against Athanasius, at once accusers, witnesses, and judges, wrote a very penitent recantation.

"Whereas we have laid many grievous charges against Bishop Athanasius, and whereas we were unable to render to you any account of those charges, we do now confess before you, and in the presence of these Presbyters our brethren, that all those reports were falsehoods and fabrications, and utterly inconsistent with his character."

Many of his enemies also came to him privately and asked pardon. Many who had adhered to the Arians, came and abjured their errors. The numbers of the sect began rapidly to diminish.

We come now to a new struggle. Three years after the Saint's

return, Constantius was dead, (A. D. 350) Magnentius the usurper of the West sent messengers to Egypt to try to gain the Archbishop. The people would very gladly be rid of Constantius; and, according to the opinions and tactics of some Christian teachers in those days, it would have been the right thing for Athanasius to ally himself with such a friend, and so obtain a triumph for himself. But he was not the man to make politics help religious ends, nor religion to serve political schemes.

Constantius also was anxious to have our Bishop's favor. Weak and vacillating as he was, he was not too sure of his throne. We find him trying to make himself more secure by murdering his own relatives, until Julian his cousin and successor was the only one left. He sent his most trusty messengers therefore to assure Athanasius that the death of Constans should not leave him unprotected. At peace in his Diocese, he need not fear the wiles of his enemies, but should go on building up his people in faith and holiness. The prefect also, for the same reason, was told that the movements already in progress against the Bishop must stop.

In such circumstances the true man has but one course, and few doubts trouble him. Where others find uncertainty, weighing interest against principle, he finds none; he collected his people together, prayed for the safety of the realm and of the Emperor, and confirmed his flock in allegiance even to Constantius, the persecutor of himself and his faith. The time came when in writing his apology to deliver it to the Emperor, he could appeal to this, for all Egypt knew it. The usurper was put down and Constantius was sole Emperor of East and West. Arians alone had his ear. His eunuchs and other parasites were not likely in those days to be found on any other side, and they accused Athanasius of having written to Magnentius. Constantius had shown weakness of which, no doubt he was soon ashamed. Before long, he declared that only his affectionate regard for his brother had induced him to recall the Bishop of Alexandria. "I thought," said Athanasius, "that after so many proofs concerning me, the adversaries would hide their faces, and regret that they had calumniated others; but I was mistaken." A man like our Saint, so much greater than the world's ruler, and so invincible in his opposition to those who wished to change Christ's pure Church into the instrument of their own base ends, must be removed if the Emperor would have

peace. If they had both lived one hundred years earlier, it would have been enough for the Emperor to speak the word, and Athanasius would have been delivered to the fire or to the lions. But the Church was giving some nótions of order and justice to that decaying old world. There must be a semblance of justice before the second Bishop in the Empire could lose his life.

The storm which swept over the East reached Constantinople, and the venerable Paul, twenty years a Bishop, three times exiled before, was banished for the fourth and last time. It was whispered, "the Patriarch has been strangled," which was probably the fact. Everywhere threats were again followed by chains, scourges, loss of goods, exile or death, unless Catholics would commune with the Arians. Word was sent to the magistrates, threatening fines unless they compelled the Bishops to subscribe the Arian creeds, and the condemnation of Athanasius. And when it seemed so expedient, and at the same time so conciliatory, to use Scripture terms alone, and not insist on such new words as ὁμοούσιος, and so easy to give up one man, what wonder that great numbers subscribed as required? The history of Catholic Faith in its struggles with error in our own day might furnish a striking parallel.

Then came the great gathering of three hundred Bishops at Milan, (A. D., 355.) Twenty years had now passed since the young Bishop stood up at Tyre to vindicate his own cause, and the cause of Christ; eight years since Constantius sent him home bidding all charges to be cancelled and all be reconciled. *Four hundred* letters of Bishops desiring communion or friendship with him had come from all parts of the world—from Britain on the West, to the Euphrates on the East. Does it seem credible that anything but Satanic spite and opposition to the truth could make this sensual Emperor with his courtiers drive these poor Bishops into cancelling all they had done before, and condemning Athanasius? But so it was. The Arians met privately. They were not numerous, few Bishops coming from the East. They demanded that Athanasius be condemned before anything else was done. On the other hand, the faithful required that the Nicene Creed be first signed, as the test of Christian men; for the Arians were already committed against him as an opponent of their principles, and their ex-parte trial had long before condemned him. The scene is not obscure to us. Dionysius, the Bishop of Milan, sits

down to head the list. Valens tears it from his hand. This in Church. People hear that the Nicene Creed is in danger from these Christian Bishops. There is great excitement. The Synod can no more meet in Church, but assemble in the royal palace. The Emperor, behind a curtain, is unseen. An edict setting forth Arian principles and condemning Athanasius is laid before them. It has been revealed to Constantius in a dream. Impetuous Lucifer of Cagliari calls it blasphemous. We can fancy the scene growing more confused and excited. The Emperor rushes from behind his curtain, his guards crowding round with drawn swords. "Let Athanasius be condemned." "Ursacius and Valens have retracted," and so on is the respectful reply. For some heroes are there. Lucifer of Cagliari has already spoken. Besides, there is Paul of Treves, Metropolitan of Gaul, Eusebius of Vercellæ, Dionysius of Milan. "It is not according to the Canons" they add. "What I will, is Church law," the Emperor replies; "in Syria the Bishops do as I bid them." The poor Bishops lift up their hands and beg him to remember that the Church is God's empire, and not his, and to let Church discipline alone. But he draws his sword, and orders his eunuchs to drag them out of the palace.

One more such scene we see at Milan. Lucifer and Eusebius of Vercellæ, not afraid of any one, stand up in council to defend Athanasius. Ursacius and Valens having recanted, their testimony is not to be believed. Who then accuses him? The Emperor rises. "*I* am his accuser." But sturdily the two Catholics reply that it is not just to try a man unless the accused be present to defend himself. The scene ends in confusion and horror. Many frightened give up Athanasius and receive the Arians. Eusebius, Lucifer and others, still steadfast, while many yield, go in chains to exile, or in dark dungeons—some to the rocks or sands of Arabia or Mount Taurus, or far up the Nile to the burning wastes where will lie their bones. The legate of Rome, a Deacon, is stopped and lashed by some eunuchs, Bishops Ursacius and Valens looking on and directing. Dionysius, of Milan, is an exile in the wilds of Cappadocia, whence he never returns. The new Bishop of this great Church is a barbarian from Cappadocia, who seizes Church revenues, but cannot even speak the language of the people. But wherever the exiles go, they declare the true faith,

and the very sight of their wrongs preaches the vileness and frauds of the Arians.

Liberius, of Rome, writes to the exiled Bishops praising their constancy, "Let them pray for him that his faith fail not."

The time soon came when he needed these prayers. The prominence of his See made his temporary fall the more tremendous for himself, and, in its consequences, the more disastrous to Christendom. He was first visited at Rome by the eunuchs. Bribes and cajolery were tried, a handsome sum of money being presented to him, which he sent back. Then he was threatened, but threats he cast off in the same manner. Then, by night, for fear of rescue on the part of his people, guards seized him and carried him off to the Emperor. After an angry debate he too was exiled. For two years steadfast, but at length worn out by ill treatment, faith yielding to despair, he gave up. He lived, however, long enough to try to repair the injury which he had done.

Father Hosius comes before us for the last time. Good old man, now one hundred and one years old, he writes stiffly back to the Emperor's cajolery and threats:

"I am old enough to be your grandfather. Sixty years ago, in the persecution under your grandfather Maximian, I confessed the faith, at the peril of my life. And if you persecute me, I am ready now to endure anything rather than to shed innocent blood, and betray the truth. Cease these proceedings, I beseech you, and remember that you are a mortal man. Be afraid of the day of judgment, and keep yourself pure thereunto. *Intrude not into Church matters, but learn them from us.* God hath put into your hand the kingdom, into ours His Church. It is written, 'Render unto Cæsar, etc.' *It is not permitted us to exercise an earthly rule, nor have you, sire, authority to offer sacrifice.* Who has persuaded you, at this late hour to forget your own letters and declarations? These men desire, by your means, to injure them they hate, and wish to make you the minister of their wickedness, that through your help they may sow the seeds of their heresy in the Church."

These are words which should be read again as showing how the fathers of Nice regarded their office, and what answer they would teach us should be returned to false intruders on it. Father Hosius lay in a filthy and damp dungeon, scourged, racked, and then left with the iron eating into his old sinews. It could not be permitted to go abroad that this most venerated confessor, who thirty-four years before presided at Nice, refused assent to the imperial measures. So a year passed, and then the old man saved

himself by giving up so far as to commune with the Arians, although he still would not denounce Athanasius. He could not gain many more days of life, and on his death-bed he lamented what he had done under compulsion, and warned all against the Arian heresy.

The web which Athanasius' enemies were weaving with such industry was drawn closer and closer around him. A narrow path lay before him, and one which could be, at best, only torture to his feet.

And here there rises before our eyes a spectacle, which, in its moral grandeur has few like it in history. It is as if fair lands, fruitful fields, and splendid cities, had sunk beneath the ocean waves, and one solitary peak alone lifted its rocky summit over the waste of waters. Truth seems to have sunk. For almost all whom the eye perceives in history's picture have either renounced the faith or are perishing in exile. Only the faithful in Alexandria anxiously await their hour. This is all that the human eye can perceive; what God or angels see in secret places is known to God or angels, not to man.

Constantius gave secret orders to a notary of his to go to Alexandria, and put the Bishop out of the way; for the Emperor still seemed afraid of the people of that city, even in his hour of triumph and success. The notary gave orders to Lyrianus, the General of Egypt, that Athanasius should leave the city. But our Bishop was always a match for them. Let them put down their commands *in writing*, he respectfully said; "for he had letters from the Emperor, and so had his people, annulling all charges and bidding him to remain at home in peace." Very necessary was it for him to ask for these written orders, for otherwise, officers might act their own pleasure and take care of the consequences. Probably the Emperor himself had been ashamed to write, and trusted to his servants to execute his wishes and relieve him from responsibility. Then, if the thing miscarried, he would have a loop-hole by which to escape. The saint could not get the writing he demanded, but an agreement was made between him and the others that he should rest undisturbed until a messenger sent to Constantius, should bring further instructions.

Meanwhile the legions of foreign mercenaries from upper Egypt and Libya, were secretly gathered around Alexandria. Then in the midst of perfect quiet the storm burst in its fiercest rage.

We can picture it. The scene is at S. Thomas' Church, th largest in Alexandria; for they have no proper Cathedral there It is the night before some feast, and the Church is crowded i every corner by men, women and children. For times of troub bring them in crowds to their sanctuaries. Many soldiers sur round the Church. The news is whispered throughout the va area. Athanasius, calm and collected, bids them sing Psalm 136, "O give thanks unto the Lord." The murmur grows louder. There is a crash of breaking doors; then flights of arrows and javelins. Arms rattle; swords flash in the light of the lamps. Then shrieks of women follow; then low groans. The soldiers are forcing their way up towards the Bishop. S. Athanasius bids his Deacon call the people to prayer, and then dismisses them. Many are trampled down in the rush to escape; some, pierced with arrows or javelins; many, stripped and robbed. S. Athanasius, rises from his throne; clergy and other friends urge him to depart, but he will not leave until the people are gone. Then he passes out through the midst of the soldiers, one cannot say how, and is gone, no one knows where. Calm, peaceful, sublime, he prepares to lay his cause before the Emperor himself. Very moderate are the words which he uses of the injuries done to him and his people, and very grandly worded is the oration, with wonderful skill also to meet accusations, and present his wrongs with reverence for Cæsar, while doing justice to his own cause. He cannot, will not assume that the Emperor has had any share in the violence used. He recounts the new charges against himself, and answers them. But purely human feelings seem lost in a sense of the dignity of his office, the greatness of the cause which he represents. The falsity of the former charges of Ursacius and Valens argues the falsity also of these. His enemies said that he had stirred up the brothers against each other, exasperating Constans against Constantius.

"In truth I am ashamed even to have to defend myself against such charges as these which I do not suppose that even the accuser himself would venture to make mention of in my presence. He knows that I was never so bereft of my senses as even to be open to suspicion of having conceived such a thing. Your most Christian brother was not a man of so light a temper, nor I a person of so much consequence, that we should communicate together on a subject like this. I never even saw your brother in private, but always in company with the Bishop of the city, and the master of the palace and others."

Then Athanasius with his usual care and precision gives the nes.

I request you to call to mind the conversations I had with *you.* Did I ak evil before you even of the Eusebians who have persecuted me? If ı I imputed nothing, when I had a right to speak, how could I be so mad o slander a king to a king, a brother to a brother? When I left Alexan-, I did not go to your brother, but to Rome to lay my cause before the urch there. Neither did I write to him, until the Eusebians accused me ıim; then I sent my apology from Alexandria."

So he traces every step, describes every interview, and chal-ges his accuser to name time and place.
So also he writes concerning the usurper Magnentius.

I know not how to answer the charge. Believe me, most religious prince, ave often doubted with myself whether any one were mad enough to e such a lie. But now the Arians say they have a copy of my letter to gnentius. Many sleepless nights have I lain awake while I opposed these ı as if they were present; and I cried out and prayed with tears, that I ht find your ears open to hear my cause. As for that usurper and mur-ır, while we were utterly ignorant of one another, what could induce me rite to him? *What* could I write? You have done well to murder the ıce who has honored me? whose kindnesses I shall never forget? or, 'I rove of your conduct in destroying our Christian friends and most hful brethren?' Is it not madness even to suspect me of such ıing?"

So he answers other charges too tedious to enumerate; always ally candid and respectful, but firm and steadfast. Lastly, cerning the command to leave his Church. He had it under Emperor's own hand, that he should not be disturbed, and st not give ear to disturbers. He had therefore only asked evi-ce that the Emperor had ordered otherwise. For he would have yed at once. He was not one of that stubborn set who make ıstice on the part of rulers a pretext for dishonoring them in ıt belongs to their office; and he kept a wonderful and dignified nce concerning the robberies and murders in the Churches of ıxandria, some, at least, of which he must have well known.
Vith this apology he meant to appear before the Emperor. But 's came to him that the storm was raging over the world, and in his city alone. And while he was astonished to hear of the ishment of Liberius, Hosius, and others, and of the scourging torturing of many, there was information from another quarter,

that many Bishops of Egypt and Libya had been driven into the deserts and rocks, and their Churches given up to the Arians.

"Even so," he says, "I did not give up my intention of going to you until I received a third report that letters had been sent to Ethiopia to have search made for me that I might be given up to your officers; and that any of the clergy or laity of Alexandria who should refuse to commune with the Arians should suffer death."

And a very extraordinary letter from the "most religious and Christian prince" was produced in Alexandria, headed, "Constantius to the Alexandrians."

"It is the part of royalty to embrace you above all others, because you have cordially acquiesced in our opinions, abominating that impostor and cheat, [Athanasius.] The majority of the citizens had their eyes blinded, and a man who had come from the lowest depths of infamy, obtained authority among them. How can I describe him more truly than by saying he was in no respect superior to the meanest of the people? This illustrious person did not wait for judgment to proceed against him, but sentenced *himself* to the banishment which he deserved. So a long farewell to him. And we advise Athanasius' friends to renounce their zeal for him; otherwise they will bring themselves into peril before they know what they are doing. For while that rascal is driven from place to place, being convicted of the basest crimes, for which he would only suffer what he deserves, if one were to kill him ten times over, it would be inconsistent in us to suffer these flatterers and juggling ministers of his to exult against us, men of whom orders have long ago been given to the magistrates that they should be put to death."

Athanasius could not go to Constantinople. His people could not worship where Arians profaned the Altars and the name of Christ, for they had not learned the "liberality" of modern times. They sought the solitudes of the cemetery or of the desert. East of Alexandria, covering the heights which border on the sea, was the city of the dead. As you left the gate at the head of the magnificent avenue which traversed the metropolis from east to west, its entire four miles of length, you entered gardens where the dead were made ready for interment. Beyond, you saw the sepulchres, and, beyond all, the desert wilds of Libya. In such a place, the Saturday after Pentecost, we see a company of the faithful secretly gathering together to worship God in truth and peace. They are chiefly women and children; for their helplessness makes them brave, fearing no harm. But suddenly, through the palm groves, three thousand soldiers burst forth on their affrighted eyes.

ıe sound of blows, and shrieks, and groans, fills the air. Some ur men of the company are seized. The neighboring palms ıpply tough rods, the leaves being removed, and the thorny spines maining; and these poor Christian people, first stripped, are ourged and lacerated, the thorns not remaining on the *rods.* hen the sun goes down over Alexandria's palaces, his last rays ine on the dying and the dead. We spare our readers much that is rrible or disgusting in these scenes, only selecting enough to ow through what fearful days our Bishop was passing. Even e butchered dead could not be had for burial except when large ibes procured such mercy; otherwise they were cast out to the gs, the prowling scavengers of eastern cities, until their friends me by night, and tried, sometimes in vain, to recognize the form a brother, sister, wife or child.

More plainly spoken than Athanasius' apology, is the protest of e people of Alexandria, and full, also, of the old hero-spirit of ıristendom. After telling their pitiful story, they add:

"Now if an order has been given that we should be persecuted, we *are ready to suffer martyrdom.* But if it be not by order of the Emperor, we ε that we may not again be assailed. And we believe that when his Pie- shall be informed of what has taken place, he will be greatly displeased, d will do nothing contrary to his oath, but will again give order that our shop Athanasius shall remain with us."

Constantius only laughed at them. At first he had been careful r the forms of justice; very soon he abandoned them altogether. Even the poorest came under this iron yoke. Food and alms had en regularly distributed to the sick, the needy, the widows and phans. Constantius gave orders that the money should be given the Arians; George, the new Bishop, kept it for himself. nd who is this that sits on Athanasius' throne, to lead and guide ıristian folk in Alexandria? We know not where to look for his unterpart unless it be in those portions of onr cities which furnish with a certain kind of "politicians." George was a native of ıppadocia. Of low birth, but of worse manners; ignorant, and of d morals; he was a parasite of the army and the court, know- g no virtue but to serve his own appetite. He had "made oney," by supplying the army until his detected frauds compelled hasty flight. He professed Arianism, and the Eusebians found m a manageable tool. So in his wanderings he discovered himself

at Alexandria. What could induce even such an Emperor as Constantius to have such a man, by force of arms, made bishop? But so it was. Avarice led him to use his episcopal power as prefects often used theirs. He got monopolies of salt, nitre, paper, etc. He had taxes imposed of which a liberal share came to himself. We shall not hear of his end for some time; God's avenging ministers wait, for He is eternal.

This man with the prefect gave the heathen mob to understand that the Emperor would be gladly rid of the Catholic Christians altogether. And they were very ready to use their opportunities. Along the harbor, looking out upon the blue waves of the Mediterranean a great Church had been built near the imperial palace. For the converts, in St. Athanasius' time, had required new and larger Churches. It was a Wednesday service. Most of the people had left the Church, but a few, chiefly women, remained praying. With stones and clubs the mob looked into the Church. They cursed; they filled the air with obscenities; they beat the helpless worshipers, until those that were not wounded or senseless, had all escaped half naked. Then they seized the wooden altar, the seats of the clergy, the robes, the Holy Scriptures, and books of prayer, piled them up in the broad space before the Church, and made a fire of them, while obscene songs took the place of prayers. Searching for Athanasius, they broke open and robbed houses, not sparing even sepulchres.

And throughout Egypt, the same wretched scenes were repeated. Old Bishops, too feeble or too ill to walk, were driven or dragged to the horrid wastes on either side of the fertile Nile Valley. Some died on the road, while others left their bones, and their misery in the desert. In all, more than thirty Bishops were thus exiled.

Then Church-offices were put up for sale. Heathen professed themselves Arians, and purchased the office of Bishop. In the midst of all this horrible gloom we see one little ray of sunshine glimmering as if it had entered some loathsome dungeon; officers come in search of Melas, a faithful Bishop of some little Egyptian town. They enter the Church, but see nobody except a somewhat decrepit man trimming the church-lights. He has on an old cloak, greasy with oil. They ask if the Bishop is there. He says courteously, "yes," and offers to lead them to him. They notice

ɔright eyes, and their errand being very plain, wonder at their ing a treacherous renegade so ready to help them. So he takes ı to the Bishop's house; they being tired, he makes them sit n, gives them some of his vegetable dinner, brings them water, then, after dinner, when they ask him to show where the Bishop ding; he mildly says, "I am the Bishop." They tell him nly what they came for; but that they have lost the heart to their work. He replies, that he will have no easier lot than rest of his brethren, but will go into exile along with them if r must go.

ı such scenes six weary years slowly passed away. And meane, where was our great Bishop? Of one thing we may be r sure, he never at any time, forgot the flock which God had n him, but ever guided them through trusty messengers, or by etters. Neither did he forget the welfare of the whole Churcholic. But in dark caves, or the cemeteries, or the horrid ptian desert, he was penning his great work, which went forth he defence of the Faith, and the strengthening of the faithful ughout the world.

onstantius had despatched letters in every direction, even to the istian princes of Ethiopia, to whom Athanasius had sent the pel, bidding them drive out the minister if he should find refuge ı there. Rewards were offered for him, alive or dead. Counts, ects, armies, were in search of him.

among the sun-scorched, rugged, barren rocks that lined the ey of the Nile, here and there a hermit or a society of hermits found a home. We can easily picture the scene; for while erations come and go, like passing shadows over the earth, they e her much as they found her. Those hermits fifteen hunl years ago, made their habitation in those rock-hewn cham-, or among those deserted palaces, sepulchres, temples, which remain as they left them. There they felt as none could feel re or since, both from the dying world which they had left, from the memorials of a dead world around them, the emptiı of human glory and the transitoriness of man himself. For y saw around them works built to last forever, while the buildlike the coral-worm, could only construct his tomb and pass y nameless and forgotten. And far off in the world which they forsaken, seeing all its magnificence of art and civilization

sinking into decay, to the eyes of these hermits the world itself seemed ready to dissolve, and they possessing their souls in peace, waited for the speedy coming of the great Restorer, their divine Redeemer.

What Athanasius' eyes saw toward the eastern deserts of Lybia, we may still behold: abrupt, bare jagged peaks; red rocks burnt by the sun's perpetual glare. Wild gorges along the burning sands below, may lead through them, and offer here and there a level spot of earth, where with patient care a few vegetables can be raised. Occasionally also, a falling torrent plunges down the cliffs, but is lost in the sand. No wonder that the gloomy Egyptian mind, familiar with such scenes, colored even the Gospel with sombre hues, and seized readily upon the dark side of the truths of humanity, of sin, of the vanity of earthly things, and of everlasting death.

Men of congenial spirits peopled these horrid wastes. In large communities sometimes, yet always living solitary, in places where meager subsistence might be gained, even tens of thousands formed societies; until it seemed that half of the population must be found in those strange, but pure and religious communities. Their cells were hewn out in the soft red rock, many of them carved and painted for the mausoleums of forgotten kings. From these, far up the mountain-side, the hermits looked out over these ruined and half buried temples, palaces, and avenues of sphinxes.

South of Alexandria and not far away, amid such mountains and deserts, in a place known as Nitria—where even the one gift to the poorest, water, flows brackish and disgusting, full of salpeter—were one thousand hermits. On an island up the Nile, a far more fertile spot, however, there are said to have been fifty thousand. At another place, where old temples were converted into churches, a cœnobite city of thirty thousand was dedicated to the true God.

Strange creatures appear to us these old hermits of Egypt; a coarse linen shirt and a sheepskin their only clothing; legs and feet bare; a long staff in their hand; their only bed a mat or blanket. A few ounces of bread with a little fish or salad their only food; water their only drink. They have no property whatever, not even for their society. Regular labor is a penance and the fulfilment of Adam's curse. Yet they are not altogether strangers to letters. Many, indeed, cannot read, but others copy

Greek and Roman classics. Palm-leaf mats, and baskets made and sold provide the little means for their wants.

These strange people were not only St. Athanasius' messengers and secretaries to Alexandria and to the whole church, but his protectors also. Pursued to one such spot, he was hurried by them to another, while they freely offered their own breasts to the sword, that they might save that precious life.

Would any one have imagined what new charges were spread abroad? It was that the most contemptible cowardice had made him run away, the cowardice of a self-convicted conscience. To keep silence then, would have been criminal.

First, of the cowardice:

"I have endured all things, and dwelt with wild beasts, not doubting but that the truth would come to light. Would it have been best for me to give myself up to death from these men, who would pretend your orders for killing me? Certainly, this would not become me; nor you, a king that follows Christ, to be accounted the murderer of Christians, and especially of Bishops."

He cites the example of Prophets and Apostles, and shows how senseless would be the folly of allowing godless men to gain their end by putting him out of the way.

Silence also, concerning wrongs, would have been weakness, not charity. Forcible, holy but burning with fiery indignation, are the words in which at length, he exposes to others the emperor's crimes and defends himself.

Yet Constantius' wish was fulfilled. No place for Athanasius was left in the Roman empire. And still he was in Alexandria, guiding, watching, directing, as of old. The sweet waters of the Nile had long been brought into the city through canals, and stored in vast underground-cisterns, whose arches one may still see in some places, story over story. In one of such dark, damp retreats, the heroic Bishop was hidden for a long time. Yet even that hiding-place, at last, was not safe. A servant of one of his Christian brothers betrayed him. At day-break she brought a party of soldiers to the spot, eager to get the reward offered for Athanasius' head. They found an empty cistern. That very night he had fled, and, with curses they gave their treacherous guide such a beating as she deserved.

Other things during these six years have passed away into darkness. Some have supposed, from what St. Athanasius says, that in disguise he was in Italy at Rimini, and in the east at Seleucia, lending his aid at the councils there. Certain it is, that if unseen himself, his influence was felt throughout Christendom, apparently the only earthly hope of the scattered faithful, exiled, robbed, imprisoned, murdered in every quarter.

In the great world all this time, things did not stand still. They never do. Each principle, each party, works on, moves on, towards its end. The opponents of the old faith, though united as such, when compelled to declare themselves showed as usual, their own endless differences. Semi-Arians approached toward the old faith. Eusebians, trimming their course nicely, would use only Scripture terms, and profess nothing which would injure their prospects. Anomeans took the plain, bold, consistently blasphemous position that Christ was only a great and good man, who *might* have sinned. It confuses us to follow their fragmentary divisions. Councils were held as usual. Eastern Bishops met at Seleucia, one hundred and fifty of them; forty Eusebians, one hundred and ten Semi-Arians; the former, being politicians, as usual getting the better of their less skilful opponents. At Rimini, in North-eastern Italy, there were some four hundred; eighty of them Arians. There the poor Bishops were kept by the Emperor for months, winter coming on, a season when travelling was scarcely to be thought of except at great peril of life. They were poor in purse. They were cajoled, threatened, frightened, and deceived. The leaders of the other party disclaimed Arian opinions, and insisted only on Scripture terms. They proposed, too, that all should together, sign a paper denouncing those who say that Christ "is a creature like other creatures." The Bishops signed it, supposing that it meant that Christ is not a creature at all. The shrewder Arians interpreted it that Christ *is* a creature of God, but different from others. And so the whole world as S. Jerome expresses it, "wondered to find itself Arian." Truly the Church was on the edge of a precipice deep and hopeless. Yet there was more hope than the eye could see, for while Constantius was murdering the guides of the people, their hearts remained steadfast. The violence of the Arians alienated the people more and more. Cunning, worldly men, they had committed themselves to Scripture

ms, but the people took their words according to the faith. autifully says Hilary, "The ears of the people are holier than minds of the priests."

The end of six such years came at last; and the end of the enty-four years of Constantius. Error had had its day. Twenty-e Creeds had shown how hopelessly changeable is rationaliz-; concerning Divine mysteries. Julian the Apostate, the fin-ed scholar, the elegant writer, the conceited philosopher, was peror. He had seen a not very edifying picture of Christen-n. He would gladly see what he considered very unphilosophic erstitions swept away. But what to substitute when old thenism was effete, and the vulgar must have some kind of reli-n? There was no better way to prepare the ground for his re-ed philosophy under old heathen names than to set sect against t, and to let them destroy one another. So Athanasius was in restored to his people.

Was it at this time that the Saint received that joyous welcome which his friend, S. Gregory, speaks, whose words we quoted a previous Article? The scene paints itself on the fancy. He eated on an ass, as when his Master entered Jerusalem. Suf-ings among his people at home, and his own sufferings away from m, had bound them together as only men can be bound by fering in a common cause. Miles and miles away from the city multitude have poured forth to greet their long lost Bishop. e joyous procession arranges itself, class by class, age by age, de by trade; Bishops, rulers, and the chief citizens of the althy merchant city; and the poorest, too, for Athanasius is as ch theirs as any others'. Children strew flowers and palm nches, and sing their carols. Some burn incense along the road; ers throw down their cloaks beneath his feet. Eventide ap-aches as he enters, and the city blazes forth in light along the ad avenue. People go out of their houses now to celebrate na-nal triumphs. At Alexandria they went forth to meet a *shop.*

The rich gave feasts; the poor rejoiced in their friend restored, ile they shared the gifts distributed by the wealthy. The Arians, course, restored the Churches to their rightful owners; but their semblies were undisturbed. None were persecuted, none suffered property or person; in nothing but the stings of their

own consciences. One after another, until multitudes were numbered, they and heathen too came and professed the faith, and were affectionately received by the Bishop. For he had ever said, "The Gospel of the Church is to rule by persuasion and love; not by force and arms." Not three years had passed since the shameful scenes at Rimini, and a mere partisan would have divided and ruined all. But lovingly would the Saint receive all, even the hypocritically disguised. Let all sign the Nicene Creed, and stand as brothers united in that bond. In the day of prosperity and power, the Catholics of Alexandria kept down every outraged sense of iniquity; enduring with patience in the day of adversity, like the martyrs whose children they were, in better days they forgave, and opened their arms to those who had inflicted on them every possible injury. Beautifully says an eye-witness:

"Harmonious, like a well-tuned harp, his life, his doctrine, his exile, his return; not carried away by prosperity nor by anger at those who had ruined him and his Church. He administered the affairs of those by whom he had been injured with so much gentleness that they could not say that his return was unpleasing, even to them. He purged the Temple of the unbelievers, as Christ did, but not with the whip of small cords. But he wrought by persuasive words; he reconciled those who were divided. He set the light of faith in the Triune God where it shone far and wide. His letters went everywhere; his counsel was everywhere regarded. The faith might seem suddenly restored."

But Julian was disappointed, and therefore anxious to be rid of Athanasius, whom he bitterly hated. His philosophers and magicians truly told him that that man was the great obstacle in his way. He was recalled, said the Emperor, but not restored to his Church. Let the Prefect banish him. News had spread that Julian would restore the old idolatry. The diminishing numbers that wanted those days back, wrote to Julian that the Patriarch was leading all after him, and that their rites were hindered. And, with their own Egyptian superstition, they revived the old story that Athanasius was a wizard, and said that he secretly murdered infants, to inspect their entrails, and predict fortunes. This too was a serious matter for the imperial philosopher, who like many another rejector of the mysteries of the Catholic faith, was full of superstitions of his own.

Christians wrote, begging peace for their dear Bishop, but Ju-

an's philosophers told him that he could do nothing until Athanasius was out of the way.

So troops came to seize him. The great Church which he had built, the Cesarean had plundered and burnt. But he had been warned, or foresaw the danger, and was on his way by night, through the canals, and up the Nile, in his little boat. First, however, he took affectionate farewell of a few of his people with words of hope. "Fear not, my children, this cloud is a little one, and will soon pass away."

The pursuers are after him—the Count and his troops; and bribes and malice urge them on faster than Athanasius' frightened and exhausted rowers can propel their boat. As the pursuers reach a certain village they inquire if the Bishop's boat is far up the river. "He is only a little while passed." "Now row, my men, and a pound of silver to each man, if we take him before sunset."

Athanasius learns, too, that his pursuers are close behind. His companions row with all speed, but beg him to leave the boat and escape into the desert. "Be not frightened, my children," he calmly says; "let us rather go to meet our persecutors, that they may know that greater is He who defends us, than he who pursues us." And he has the little boat turned around, and steers through the midst of the pursuers. "Is Athanasius far up the river?" is the cry, as they hail the boat slowly making its way by them. "He is close by you," is the reply, and the diminutive craft holds its course uninterrupted towards Alexandria's canals. "Now make your oars fly, and we shall have him." We do not see how long they kept on rowing but we seem to detect for once a merry smile on the Bishop's face.

But he was not safe, he knew, in Alexandria with any of the Clergy, or any well-known friend. Very touching seems to us what we meet with at this time, afflicting us in its purity and desolation. A young girl of twenty summers has vowed her years to the service of the Church; and she has her little room near the Temple. She is startled from her slumber at midnight by a knocking and a voice. A venerable old man—*old* we may call him now, since he has turned sixty-five—asks a hiding place in Christ's name. He holds a Bishop's staff in one hand, a lamp in the other. At first the girl is too much frightened, to give more than a glance

at him, but as he stands motionless, and she must look again, even to shut the door, she sees it is her Lord Bishop. Maiden shame laid aside, she gives up her room to him, reverently waits on him, doing all menial offices, bringing him food and books, and carrying his letters unsuspected. And this she does as long as the apostate Emperor lives, happily not many months. Long years afterward, when the Bishop was at rest and she was an aged woman, she used to delight to tell of the dark night when the great Athanasius sought her protection, and she, a young girl, became his only guardian.

Julian was struck down, either by a Persian dart, or a javelin thrown from among his own ranks. A Christian Emperor, Jovian, was on the throne. The people, going to their Church, looked with wonder and incredulous joy at the Bishop's throne. It was Athanasius himself seated there. He had resumed his place without waiting for Jovian's letter, which soon recalled all the exiled Bishops.

The Bishops met once more in synod at Alexandria. What should be done with those who had professed Arianism through fear or bribes? Athanasius said, "Restore them, that all may go home with greater joy," and it was done. Little more remained before his sun set in calm tranquility. He was past seventy. Jovian, calling himself a Christian, and restoring the Church everywhere, sent a kind invitation to the aged Bishop to visit the Court. He had not appeared in such a manner since his youth, when he stood before Constantine. Jovian asked to be instructed in the Faith, and Athanasius showed him the *Nicene Creed* as the unchanging faith of Apostles, Martyrs, and the loving Church of God.

Calm, eloquent as ever with the eloquence of truth, simplicity and holiness, he ruled for ten years more, and then laid down to rest, May 25th, A. D. 373. There was one return, a brief one, of the days of darkness, passing like the shadow of a midsummer cloud. Valens was Emperor of the East, an Arian, persecuting the Catholics. He issued his edict, banishing all whom Constantius had exiled. The people tried to defend their Bishop on the ground that Constantius himself had recalled him, but in vain. At midnight troops surrounded his house to steal him quietly away without alarming his people. Baffling the wiles of his enemies so as to be reputed to be a magician, he was gone; but

·t far. His father's sepulchre, in the gardens beyond the city, ıs this time his hiding place. The excitable multitude was, how-er, in such a tumult, and Valens himself so insecure, that he was ıd to recall the beloved Bishop.

Here then we rest. The old heathen world and its princes were ırning that while all things beside were going to ruin, there was ·thing so strong, so enduring, as the Gospel, the Faith, the Cath-c Church. The old world had to measure its strength with this ·ung David, and be brought down to the dust, before it felt this eat truth. Wonderful as was God's work in Athanasius, more ınderful his work for us through this man. No man henceforth uld dispute the ὁμοούσιον and yet count himself a member the body of Christ. The Saint's epitaph is expressed in few ırds by S. Gregory.

'He departed this life with far greater honor and glory than what he had eived in his triumphant entries into Alexandria, so much was his death nented by all good men; and his name remained engraven on their hearts. r he left the world amid the tears of many, which speaks more than pro-sions, or visible honor of any kind."

Art. VII.—THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

Among the historical questions connected with the books of the ıw Testament, few have been more contested than the date and ıce of writing of what are termed the Pastoral Epistles; the two Timothy, and the one to Titus. No question of this nature is more importance or interest.

As to the Epistle to Titus. One opinion is, that the visit to ete was made, and the Epistle written during the residence of . Paul at Corinth, of eighteen months; another that the visit was de on the return from Corinth to Ephesus going into Syria, and ı Epistle was written from Ephesus; another, that the visit took ıce during the three years residence at Ephesus and in Asia oper, and that the Epistle was sent on the return to Ephesus; other, that both have their place during the stay at Corinth of ·ee months after coming from Macedonia; and again, the visit d Epistle are placed in an interval between two imprisonments

at Rome; a long time (from four to six years) being assumed as intervening between them.*

The fluctuation of the opinion of one of the ablest of critical writers, is shown in the following passage from Michaelis.

"In the first Edition of the Introduction, I described the Epistle to Titus as written after St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome. In the second I wavered in this opinion. When I published the third, I thought it highly probable that it was written long before St. Paul's journey as a prisoner to Italy, when he touched at Crete; and at present, (1780, fourth edition), I have no doubt, that the Epistle was written before that voyage."

As to the First Epistle to Timothy, a large number of writers assign a very early date for it, generally about A.D. 57, 58, and consider, that it was written from Macedonia, when St. Paul had gone there after the riot at Ephesus.†

Wieseler and Dr. Davidson conclude that it was written within the three years residence at Ephesus, but suppose that there was a journey to Macedonia within that period, the notice of which is omitted by St. Luke; that it was written in Macedonia, or on the way there. Dr. Paley's theory is, that the First to Timothy, as well as that to Titus, were written in an interval between the two imprisonments at Rome assumed to have taken place. Bishop Pearson and others concur in this. Bishop Henry U. Onderdonk supports the same view as to the Epistle to Timothy; and although his purpose did not require an opinion, his reasoning leads to the same result as to the others.‡

In relation to the Second Epistle to Timothy, the questions seem reduced to these; whether it was written towards the close of a second imprisonment at Rome; § or of one and the only imprisonment there; || or between two imprisonments when at liberty.¶

We thus find, that whatever difference exists as to the date of

---

* Wiesinger *Bib. Com:* in Vol. 23. *Clark's Foreign Theolog. Library. Townsend's New Testament Notes*, p. 344. *Davidson's Int.* to the *New Test.* Vol. 3, p. 71. The names of the writers sustaining these various views, are stated in detail.

† *Introduction*, Vol. 4, p. 32. (2). Athanasius, Theodoret, Baronius, Hammond, Grotius, Lardner, Michaelis. See *Davidson's Intr.* Vol. III. p. 4. *Townsend's New Testament Notes*, 352.

‡ When did St. Paul place Timothy over the church at Ephesus? *Episcopacy examined*, p. 115. Other writers sustain the same view, Dr. McKnight, Conybeare and Howson.

§ Neander, Paley, Burton, Mosheim, Tomline, Huther. See the list *Davidson's Int. Van Oesterzee*, Vol. 3, p. 63.

|| Davidson, Wieseler, Otto.

¶ Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester, and Wiesinger.

the Epistles respectively, there is a large number of eminent writers concurring in the opinion, that there were two imprisonments of St. Paul at Rome, and a long interval between them. I shall term this the Interval theory, and it is thus stated by Dr. Paley.

"Upon the whole, if we may be allowed to suppose that St. Paul, after his liberation at Rome, sailed into Asia, taking Crete in his way; that from Asia and Ephesus its capitol, he proceeded into Macedonia, and crossing the Peninsula came into the neighborhood of Nicopolis, we have a route which falls in with everything. It executes that resolution expressed of visiting Colosse and Philippi. It allows him to leave Titus in Crete, and Timothy at Ephesus, as he went into Macedonia, and to write to them not long after from the Peninsula of Greece, and probably from the neighborhood of Nicopolis."*

The learned authors, Conybeare and Howson, suggest the following detailed account.

"From Rome after the acquittal in A. D. 63, across the Adriatic into Macedonia, thence to Ephesus, Colosse, and Laodicea, probably thence to Spain, and a residence there of about two years, a return A. D. 66, to Ephesus; then to Macedonia; then to Crete; to Corinth by way of Miletus; thence to Nicopolis, and so to Rome, where he was executed in A.D. 68."†

In the late Edition of the Epistles by Lange (New York, 1869) is the comment by Van Oesterzee upon the three Pastoral Letters. He assigns them all to a period of a second imprisonment. He notices what he terms a striking book of Dr. Otto, in which the theory of but one imprisonment is keenly defended.

Guericke, another advocate of the Interval theory, supposes travels partly in the East, and partly in the West. During one of these journeys, he arrived in Crete. Here he planted several churches, and left Titus to superintend them. From Crete he went to Miletus; then to Ephesus, where he wrote to Titus: and then into Macedonia. The first Epistle to Timothy was written from some place on this route. Then he went to Troas and Corinth, spending the winter at Nicopolis. Thence he went to Italy and Spain. From that place he was brought a captive to Rome, and then wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy.

Mr. Tate in his account of the journeyings leaves out Spain. He supposes that the Apostle with Timothy and Titus, sailed to Crete after his liberation, where Titus was left. From thence he

* *Horæ Paulinæ*, p. 193, Am. Edition.

† See their chronological table, vol. II. p. 560 and notes.

went into Asia, visiting Colosse and Ephesus, where Timothy was left. Then to Macedonia, and at Philippi he wrote First Timothy. Thence he summoned Titus to Nicopolis. After the winter there he went to Corinth, and from that place to Ephesus. He left Trophimus sick at Miletus, and arrived at Rome where he was imprisoned, wrote Second Timothy and suffered martyrdom. *

After examining the various theories upon this subject, two points appear very prominent. One is the exceedingly slight support which Scripture gives to the Interval theory; the next that the strongest argument by far for that theory, rests upon the alleged impossibility of reconciling passages in the Scriptures, with any other hypothesis.

This view is particularly urged in relation to the Epistle to Titus and the First to Timothy, compared with the details in Acts. The Second Epistle it is allowed was composed after the period mentioned in Acts had closed.

This "historical incompatibility," as it is termed by Wiesinger and others consists:

1. In the asserted impossibility of arranging the sequence of events chronologically and consistently.

2. In the fact that institutions of church polity are noticed in them, which were not developed until a later period of her history.

3. Upon a line of argument of a Levitical and philological nature tending to prove a later date of composition.

This last course of reasoning is scarcely relied upon by the authors who defend the Pauline origin of the Epistles, though contending for the interval theory. It is mainly used by the opponents of that authenticity. As we assume that they are genuine productions of St. Paul, we shall not notice these expositions.

The first objection is clearly the most important. If unanswerable, it is decisive. It is the one most relied upon. In examining it, I shall first seek to settle some leading dates and order of events, of great importance in guiding us.

The Council of Jerusalem was held A.D. 51, the arrival of Festus to supersede Felix in Judea was in the summer of 60, the arrival of St. Paul at Rome as a prisoner was in the Spring of 61, and the expiration of the two years imprisonment there was

---

* *Continuous History of St. Paul, Part III.* p. 118. *Davidson's Intr.* 2, 96.

nmer of 63. The great fire at Rome was in July 64, :e persecution of Christians then began.

hority as to these and other material events, such as the :lease, and the death of St. Paul, are stated in the folle.

Dates assigned for the Council at Jerusalem.

us, Wurm, Burton, ... A.D. 46.
ius, Petavius, Pearson, Schott, Hales, ... 49.
ge, Wieseler, Lardner, Conybeare and Howson, . 50.
ıont, Weiner, De Wette, Davidson, Calmet, Oxford Bible of .794, Angers, ... 51.
el, Eichhorn, Hemsen, Hug, ... 52
elis. . . . . 53.

Arrival of Festus to supersede Felix.

. . . . . 55.
Petavius, Capellus, ... 56.
'earson, Spanheim, Tillemont, De Wette, Wurm, Angers, :ler, Lardner, Davidson, Conybeare and Howson, . 60.
Hemsen, Schott, ... 61.
ichaelis, Eichhorn, Burgess. . . . . 62.

Assumed release of St. Paul.

ırton, ... 58.
ıinoel, Basnage, Townsend, ... 62.
:rthold, Teilmoner, Tillemont, Lardner, Pearson, Conybeare Howson, ... 63.
gess, (In the Spring), ... 64.
, Heinrichs, Usher, ... 65.

Death of St. Paul.

Wieseler, Schrader, Hemsen, ... 64.
Vogel, Hailes, ... 65.
, Burgess, ... 66.
Petavius, Usher, Hug, Bengel, ... 67.
:rome, Pearson, Spanheim, Conybeare and Howson, McKnight 68.

these names and dates are taken from Davidson's Table, with that of the Oxford Bible of 1795, and Conybeare ın. The latter in a full and able argument appear to us hat the recall of Felix and arrival of Festus was in the 60, and that St. Paul departed for Rome in the autumn ır. The preceding table shows the great preponderance y in favor of this opinion. Without detailing the course ıoning, we think it may be assumed as proven, that this ue date of the arrival of Festus; that St. Paul left Ce-

sarea in the Fall of 60; touched at Crete about October; spent the winter months in Malta, and arrived at Rome in the Spring of 61.

Adopting these as established dates we have a basis on which to adjust the occurrence of other events. Thus for the time previous to the arrival of Festus, we have the following periods explicitly stated. Two years residence of St. Paul at Cesarea, three years at Ephesus and adjoining places; eighteen months, "and yet a good while" at Corinth. Thus we have six years and nine months accounted for. We have besides, going back to the time of the Council of Jerusalem, the "yet a good while" at Corinth, the journey after the council through Cilicia and Syria to Antioch confirming the churches, the journey to and labors at Lystra, Derbe, Galatia, Phrygia, Troas, Nicopolis, Philippi, Corinth, and Athens, the voyage from Cenchrea, the port of Corinth, for Syria, to Ephesus, landing at Cesarea, saluting the church at Jerusalem, and going down to Antioch. After some time spent there, there was the journey over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia, and then through the upper coasts before the second visit to Ephesus. We have also the going over to Macedonia, and the journey thence to Greece, the journey back by way of Macedonia, Troas and Miletus to Jerusalem, and the abode there before the confinement at Cesarea. It cannot be supposed that these labors and journeyings occupied less than two years, making up eight years and nine months between the arrival of Festus and the Council. Nine years give the year 51 for the latter.

And it is a striking fact that the great majority of writers allow nine years between the Council and the departure for Rome; but that was a few months after Festus arrived. The preceding table also shows the great superiority of authority in favor of dates, varying from 50 to 53 as to the time of the Council, and of an equal number, and equal character, in favor of the year 51.

Pursuing the record of the Apostle after the arrival of Festus, and his reaching Rome in the Spring of 61, we are to allow perhaps a short time before he went to his own hired house. He dwelt there two years. Whether this residence then terminated, is hereafter considered. Another fact is to be noticed. The great fire at Rome occurred in July 64, and the persecution of the Christians ensued. We may regard it as almost certain that if St. Paul was in Rome at that time, he would have been sacrificed, or more

strictly confined with a view to his trial. We cannot imagine that one so conspicuous and zealous could have escaped the fires of martyrdom then so fiercely burning. Mr. Merivale supposes that the hired house was one of the buildings surrounding the Emperor's palace, and that St. Paul was placed there instead of in the dungeons under the palace floor.*

It appears to follow, with reasonable certainty, that if there was any release, it took place between the summer of 63 and that of 64. If there was no liberation, the close confinement took place at that time, and was followed by the Apostle's death.

Adopting this outline of events of the highest pertinence and weight, I have formed the following table, which will illustrate the views advocated more minutely and particularly as to the three Epistles, afterward submitted.

Table of Events connected with St. Paul, Titus, and Timothy.

A.D. 51 The Council of Jerusalem, St. Paul and Titus present.
51–52 St. Paul in Syria, Cilicia, Lystra. Selection of Timothy.
52 St. Paul at Athens. Timothy at Berea.
52 St. Paul at Corinth, Timothy joins him.
52–54 Residence at Corinth of over eighteen months.
[First and Second Thessalonians there written.]
54 Journey by Ephesus to Syria; through Phrygia and Galatia.
54 Apollos at Ephesus and return to Corinth.
54 St. Paul's return to Ephesus from the Upper Coasts.
54–57 Residence at Ephesus, Asia Proper, etc.
55 [Epistle to the Galatians written.]
56 Visit of St. Paul with Titus to Crete. Return.
Early 57 [Epistle to Titus from Ephesus.]
Early 57 Arrival of Apollos at Ephesus.
" " [First Epistle to the Corinthians written.]
Spring of 57 Timothy sent to Corinth and return.
" 57 Timothy sent to Macedonia and return.
Summer 57 The request to remain at Ephesus.
" 57 Tychicus sent to Titus.
" 57 Riot at Ephesus and departure of St. Paul.
" 57 Meets Titus in Macedonia. Return of Titus.
Autumn 57 Timothy joins St. Paul in Macedonia.
[Second Corinthians written.]
57 Labors in Macedonia. Timothy with St. Paul.
Fall 57 Journey to Greece through Illyricum.
Winter 57 Residence in Greece of three months. Timothy with him three months. [Epistle to the Romans written.]

* History of the Romans, Vol. IV. p. 212.

Spring 58 Journey into Asia and to Philippi and Miletus.
58 Arrest at Jerusalem.
58–60 Imprisonment at Cæsarea.
[First Timothy written.]
Summer 60 Arrival of Festus.
60–61 Voyage. Shipwreck, arrival at Rome.
61–63 Residence at Rome two years, etc.
[Epistles to Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon and Hebrews.]
July 64 Fire at Rome. Persecution.
64 Trial. Partial deliverance.
[Second Timothy written.]
64–65 Death.

The Visit to Crete, and Epistle to Titus.

The notices in the New Testament of the connection between St. Paul and Titus, are the following:

"Fourteen years after, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. . . But neither Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised." (Galatians ii. 1, 3.) St. Paul went up from Antioch in Syria, and it was on the occasion of the Great Council at Jerusalem that Titus was with him.*

"Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you? I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother. Did Titus make a gain of you?" (2 Corin. xii. 17, 18.) "When we were come into Macedonia our flesh had no rest. Nevertheless God comforted us by the coming of Titus; and not by his coming only, but by the consolation wherewith he was comforted in you. . . Exceedingly more joyed we for the joy of Titus, because his spirit was refreshed by you all, how with fear and trembling you received him." (Ibid. vii. 5, 7, 13, 15.)

The churches of Macedonia having desired St. Paul to take upon him the fellowship of administering to the saints, he writes.

"Insomuch that we desired Titus, that as he had begun, so he would also finish in you, the same grace." (viii. 6).

"Thanks be to God, which put the same earnest care in the heart of Titus for you. For indeed he accepted the exhortation; but being more forward, of his own accord, he went unto you." Conybeare and Howson's translation is "He has not only consented to my desire, but goes to you of his own accord." (Vol. II. p. 110.) "And we have sent with him the brother whose praise is in all the churches. . . Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner, and *fellow-laborer concerning you.*" (1 Cor. iv. 16, 23). "Paul a servant of God, etc. To Titus mine own son after the common faith. For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." (Titus i. 1, 3).

* Conybeare and Howson, I. 213, 214.

Vith the exception of the brief notice in the last chapter of Se-
l Timothy, " Titus hath departed unto Dalmatia," these are all
Scriptural passages relating to him,

etween the date of the Council of Jerusalem, and the writing
Second Corinthians was an interval of more than five years.*
hin that period that Epistle tells us, that Titus had been de-
l to minister to the Corinthians; had done so of his own ac-
l; had joined the Apostle in Macedonia; that he was to be sent
n to them; to finish the work begun; and he is called a part-
of the Apostle *concerning them.*

f for the present, we assume the visit to Crete to have been
in this period, then we have also the time, (short no doubt,) of
Apostle's being in Crete with Titus, the residence of Titus
re for an undefined time, and his further residence at Corinth,
il he went to meet St. Paul in Macedonia, to fill up the interval.
The occupations and labors of St. Paul himself may be traced as
ows. After the Council, he went through Syria and Cilicia, con-
ing the churches. He then came to Derbe and Lystra, circum-
d Timothy and took him with him. Shortly after they came
Thessalonica. He was sent away from Berea in Macedonia to
ens; and from Athens went to Corinth, where he remained
iteen months, " and yet a good while."

He then sailed to Ephesus on his way to Syria.† Thence to
area and then up to Jerusalem.‡ Then down to Antioch, and
all the country of Galatia and Phrygia. After " passing through
upper coasts,"§ he came again to Ephesus. There he spake in
Synagogue three months; then in the school of Tyrannus for
space of two years, " so that all which dwelt in Asia heard the
d, both Jews and Greeks."

Then he sent Timotheus and Erastus into Macedonia, " but he
self stayed in Asia for a season." After the riot, he departed
Macedonia, " and after going over those parts came into
ece, and there abode three months."

Ve have said that the interval from the Council at Jerusalem

—

The Second Epistle was written from Macedonia, after St. Paul had gone there
Ephesus.

This is no doubt the meaning of Acts xviii. 18, 19.

A deduction from verses 21, 22.

I suppose Bythynia and Mysia.

to the writing of Second Corinthians was over five years. We have eighteen months at Corinth, and three months and two years at Ephesus expressly defined. The phrases "and yet a good while" and for a season are indefinite, and the time necessary for all the journeyings is left for conjecture. Six years would more probably be required.

Another source of information for the solution of the question is found in the Epistles written during this period. It is I believe, undisputed, that the two Epistles to the Thesalonians were written from Corinth during this residence of eighteen months.*

That First Corinthians was written from Ephesus during the long residence there, and in the last year of such residence is generally allowed. The argument of Conybeare and Howson as to the place seems conclusive,† but their position that it was written during or after Easter founded on the passage in 1 Corinthians v. 7, is refuted by Dr. Davidson.‡ There is nothing to prevent the conclusion that it was written early in 57.

Second Corinthians was written from Macedonia during St. Paul's residence after the riot.§

On the assumption that the Epistle to Titus was written before the visit to Macedonia which took place after the riot, we have three supposable cases. *First*, that the visit was made, and the Epistle written, during the eighteen months' residence at Corinth. *Second*, that the visit was made during that period, and the Epistle written afterwards from Ephesus, and *Third*, that both visit and Epistle must be placed during the period of the residence at Ephesus.

The first supposition, advocated by Michaelis, is disposed of by Wiesinger: and, as I understand him, with the concurrence of Matthies and Bohl.‖ The argument in reply is this. The Epistle must have been written after Apollos had been at Ephesus, and gone into Achaia, before St. Paul's second and long residence at Ephesus. But this was after the abode at Corinth of eighteen months, (compare Acts xvii. 24; xix. 1, and Titus iii. 13,) and it is

* Riggenbach apud Lange Comm. Ed. 1809. Thess. p. 3 and 105. The date is fixed from 53 to 54.

† Vol. II. p. 33. ‡ Introd. Vol. III. p. 221. § Con. & Howson II. p. 97.

‖ Clark's Foreign Th. Library, Vol. XXIII. p. 246.

ear that Apollos had gone from Ephesus, and was in Corinth, or me other part of Achaia,* at the time of the Epistle.

And this decisive answer as to the date of the Epistle goes far refute the second theory, that of the visit being during the ghteen months, and the Epistle written subsequently and from phesus. It is forcibly urged by Wiesinger, that there could not ve been much time between the visit and the Epistle. It is aprent that the visit was short. Dr. Ellicott, an advocate of the terval theory, says,

"That the Apostle, not being able to remain long enough in Crete to comete the necessary organization of the churches in the island, but having left tus to complete this responsible work, sends him all necessary instruction."†

But upon this second theory there would be an interval of more an two, perhaps three years between the visit, and the Epistle. seems to follow that if the Epistle was written from Ephesus, e visit was made from that place also. And such is the opinion Smidt, Wieseler, Auger and others, among the German, and of vidson and Burton among the English commentators. Before ting the arguments supporting this theory, two general observans are of importance.

The first is upon the silence of St. Luke in the Acts of the ostles, as to any visit or Epistle. Certainly this is fairly urged inst the view of their occurrence during the period covered by Acts. But the advocates of the Interval theory place no great ss upon this silence. St. Luke is equally silent as to events inputably proven. Titus, for example, was sent by St. Paul to rinth; he joined the Apostle in Macedonia; and was again t to Corinth. Of all this there is no mention in Acts. So in the First of Corinthians shows that Timothy had been sent Corinth, and there is the like silence.

The next observation relates to the situation of Crete, in regard the progress of Christianity. Its position, size, population and tility had obtained for it the name of the Queen of Islands, and is termed by Homer the "ninety citied." Its decline began er the conquest by the Romans, yet the passing away of only one

---

* Perhaps in Crete. "Conduct—Forward on their journey" for "bring," Ellicott *Pas.* . 219, n.

† *Pastoral Epistles, Intr.* 185. "Which I for want of time, could not perform," ing Beng.

generation from that conquest could not have wholly effaced its prosperity. Jews from the island, Proselytes, were present at Pentecost.* Between the date of that event and St. Paul's long residence at Ephesus were over twenty years.† The converted Cretans carried Christianity back with them, and rapidity of progress was the law of the age. Crete was but two days' voyage from Corinth. At Corinth we have the fact of St. Paul's residence of eighteen months preaching the word of God, and of the Lord having much people there. Then from the Epistle to the Corinthians we discover, not merely the great growth of the church in that city, but the growth of errors, evils, corruptions and dissensions. It is impossible that such should have been the course and development in Corinth, and that similar influences should not have been felt in Crete. Indeed one great error and evil is strongly rebuked in both Letters; that of a Judaic Christianity.

This argument, confirmed by the wonderful expansion of Christianity in other lands, tinged inevitably with errors from heathenism not overcome, or from irradicable Jewish views, refutes the position of De Wette and others, that the Epistle was not adapted to the situation of the Cretans. It is impossible to read it carefully, and not find it in harmony with a Church planted twenty years, and growing as the Church in those ages grew. Indeed the hierarchical principle found in it, is an argument, as we trust hereafter to prove, harmonizing with the necessities of the Church, and the plans of the Apostle for the future.

We think that we have successfully excluded the theory of the visit or Epistle being before the long abode at Ephesus. Is there any thing affirmative to support the view that they took place during that abode?

If it can be proven, that the Epistle to Titus was written before First Corinthians, the question will be settled. It is almost unanimously allowed, that the latter Epistle was written from Ephesus, during the last year of the residence before the riot.‡

This leads to the consideration of the connection between St. Paul and Apollos.

---

* Acts, ii. 10, 11.

† Taking Pearson's Chronology, that most generally received, A. D. 33 to 54, 57.

‡ See Dr. Davidson's able and elaborate discussion. Vol. III. p. 90.

From Acts xviii. 24, 28, and xix. 1, 7, it appears that Apollos, Jew of Alexandria, an eloquent man "and mighty in the Scrip-ıres," came to Ephesus. He was instructed in the way of the ord, but knew only the *baptism of John*. Aquila and Priscilla cpounded unto him the way of God more perfectly. He went om Ephesus into Achaia, where he helped those who believed. 'hile he was at Corinth, St. Paul, having passed through the pper coasts, came to Ephesus. Then commenced his long resi-ence there and in Asia Proper.

Next, from First Corinthians (i. 12; iii. 4, 6,) we find, that the sult of the teaching of St. Paul and Apollos, was the rise of sects d divisions among the Corinthians; some professing to be fol-wers of Paul, others of Apollos. We find that the Apostle ıces the ministry of Apollos nearly upon a footing with his own. : have planted, Apollos watered." The latter was in all respects ımeless as to these divisions. His ministration was after that the Apostle.

Again, it is nearly certain that Apollos was with St. Paul at hesus when this First Epistle was written. (1 Cor. xvi. 12.)

Then we notice the passage in Titus, "Bring or, 'forward,' nas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently, that thing be wanting unto them." (iii. 13.)

Thus the Apostle wrote to Titus, on the supposition that Apollos s in Crete or would be.

And here the fact and tradition recorded by St. Jerome is most iking. He says, that "Apollos, in consequence of the dissension to himself, Cephas, and St. Paul, left Corinth, and went into ete. Afterwards he returned, and was the first Bishop of rinth." *

The coherence and pertinence of these facts is remarkable. ›ollos was laboring at Corinth to perfect the work begun by the ›ostle. Apollos left it for Crete. St. Paul, apprised of his parture, writes to Titus at Crete,† to forward Apollos on his ırney to join him at Ephesus. Apollos is found at Ephesus with e Apostle; is pressed to go again to Corinth; declines to do so

* Calmet Verbo Apollos.

† Conybeare and Howson show how constant was the communication for trade be-een Corinth and Ephesus.

then, but will do so at a future time. This information is given to the Corinthians, after the arrival of Apollos at Ephesus.

We may not absolutely say, that Apollos came to Ephesus in consequence of the Epistle. It may be a better conclusion that he intended to have joined the Apostle there. But this great pertinent fact remains. The Apostle supposed him to be in Crete, and urges Titus to help him in coming to Ephesus. He does join St. Paul at that place. The Epistle to the Corinthians announces this fact. The request of the Apostle is expressed before. It is expressed in the Epistle to Titus. The Epistle to Titus was therefore written before that to the Corinthians.

This Epistle must have been written so long before that to the Corinthians, as to allow of its transmission to Crete, and the journey of Apollos to Ephesus. But little time would be necessary for this. Crete is about two hundred and fifty miles from Ephesus, a voyage of between two and three days.*

The Epistle to the Corinthians was written as we have supposed before the Passover, and thus we have at least nine months of the same Pentecostal year, for the visit to Crete, return, and Epistle to Titus. We may assign the preceding fall for the visit, the winter or early spring for the Epistle.

Some objections to this conclusion are to be noticed.

Why should St. Paul writing to Titus in the winter of one year, though late, provide for meeting him at Nicopolis the ensuing winter? Our answer is, that within two or three months from the date we propose, he actually did write to the Corinthians, announcing the probability of his spending the winter with them.

He was plainly looking forward to the termination of his labors in Asia, to a visitation of Macedonia, and journey to Greece. The objection seems very slight.

Again Wiesinger in his introduction to the Epistle to Titus, says, that the Apostle sent Titus from Ephesus to Corinth, about a collection. Conybeare and Howson adopt the statement. The passages from Second Corinthians vii. 14, and xii. 18, are referred to. The first of them does not give the least support to the conjecture. The boasting to Titus was made in Macedonia. This at any rate is most probable. And as to the other passage, "I de-

* Conybeare and Howson, 100 to 120 miles a day was the average of the voyages.

ed Titus, &c.;" the request may as consistently have been made Crete, or from Ephesus, but not at it. The texts before cited ove that the supervision of Titus extended over Corinth. He s the fellow-laborer of the Apostle *concerning the Corinthians.* But another and great objection made by Wiesinger and others that it is impossible to show, how the spending the winter at icopolis corresponds with these circumstances.

The following passages bear upon the point:

"When I shall send Artemas or Tychicus unto thee, be diligent to come to me at Nicopolis; for I have determined there to winter." (Titus 12.)

Now I will come unto you when I shall pass through Macedonia; for pass through Macedonia. It may be that I will abide, yea, and winter h you." (1 Corinth. xvi. 5, 6.)

After the uproar was ceased Paul departed to go into Macedonia. And n he had gone over these parts, and given them much exhortation, he e into Greece." (Acts xx. 1, 2.)

From Jerusalem, and round about Illyricum, I have fully preached the pel of Christ." (Romans xv. 19.)

t is generally admitted, that Romans was written from Corinth ing the last residence there of three months, after the coming n Macedonia above stated.

'ychicus it is said was an Ephesian. We find him with St. l in Greece during the three months abode there, and going him from Greece into Asia by Troas. The inference is reable that he was sent to Crete as intimated that he would be; went from thence to Corinth to join the Apostle. He was iously high in the ministry. He was sent to Ephesus when St. l desired Timothy to come to him at Rome. (2 Tim. iv. 12.)

'he Nicopolis, at which the Apostle expected to pass the winter, upposed by some writers to have been the city of that name on River Nessus, upon the borders of Macedonia and Thrace.* it is stated that that city was founded by Trajan, and called Ulpea.† If so, the question is settled. That could not have n the city intended.

t is highly improbable also, that the Apostle would fix for a ter residence a place far from the extreme point of his known istration in Macedonia.

Dr. Ellicott thinks the question uncertain.

Forcellini's Dictionary, Vol. II., p. 1081. Also Merivale's Hist. of Romans, vii. 196.

Assuming that Nicopolis in Epirus was the city designed for the meeting, we have the following sequence of facts, most of which are clearly established, and the rest highly probable. They are entirely consistent, and remove all difficulty.

St. Paul informs Titus that he expects to send Tychicus or Artemus to him in Crete, and desires that he should meet him at Nicopolis in the ensuing winter.

He changes his plan, and within a few months afterwards, writes to the Corinthians, that he may probably spend the winter with them.

He does send Tychicus to Titus, apprising the latter of his change of plan, and appointing a meeting elsewhere, *viz.*, at Troas.

He goes from Ephesus to Troas, and has no rest in spirit because he does not find Titus there, (2 Cor. xi. 12.) He then proceeded into Macedonia, (Ibid. vi. 13.) Titus did meet him in Macedonia, (Ibid. vii. 6,) and Titus went back, probably carrying the Second Epistle to the Cornthians with him. The Apostle prosecuted his journey into Greece.

And here the passage from Romans is pertinent. And round about Illyricum, I have preached the Gospel. Illyricum skirted Macedonia on the North-west and West. When going over these parts, St. Paul would be upon its borders. It is probable that he journeyed by the *Via Ægnatia*, which passes through Philippi, Thessalonica, and over the Mountains to Dyrachium in Illyria, and that he then went Southward by Nicopolis into Greece.

It is stated that Origen found at Nicopolis on the shore of Actium a Greek copy of the Old Testament, worn-out, dusty, and worm-eaten. (Eusebius, vi. 16.) We may indulge the imagination that it was a copy of the Septuagint belonging to St. Paul. Doubtless that version was used by him.*

We have no further notice of Titus until he is spoken of in Second Timothy, as having gone into Dalmatia. This is a proof that that region and Achaia, the great Christian province between the Ægean Sea and Macedonia on the one side, and the Asiatic and Great Sea on the other, with the many citied Isle, was under his ecclesiastical rule. Van Espen speaks of a tradition of his being Bishop of Crete, and of Corinth, and Dalmatia.

---

* See Butler's Horæ Biblicæ, p. 16.

One objection to the sequence of events we have supposed, may be that it appears to involve a winter voyage of St. Paul from Ephesus to Crete, and transmission of the Epistle also during the winter.

Conybeare and Howson* quote from Smith's Voyages of St. Paul, a passage of Vegetius, that from the third day of the Ides of November, to the sixth day of the Ides of March† the seas are closed. For there is little light, prolonged darkness, clouds, and rain and snow. But Mr. Smith in the work referred to, Visit to Crete, and Epistle to Titus, shows, that it was the long voyages in the open seas, "where neither sun nor stars appeared," that were prevented. Guiding their course by the heavenly bodies, it was difficult and dangerous to navigate where they were obscured. It was after the vessel carrying St. Paul to Rome left Fair Havens for the open Mediterranean, that she met the fierce adverse wind, and the heavens were darkened.

Now this objection is of no force as applicable to a voyage from Ephesus to Crete. The map will show that a vessel would never be out of sight of land. To the fine harbor of Cydnus, and from thence by the shortest course, and one well sheltered, would be but one hundred miles, but by a rather longer course, there would be the protection from heavy seas, and the sight of head-lands down to the Island of Rhodes, and from thence a transit of less than eighty miles to a point in Crete, and with a large Island about midway, for guidance and shelter.

And these observations apply with even greater force to a winter voyage from Ephesus to Cenchrea, the port of Corinth. There is only a short distance of exposure to the open sea, after passing the Island of Coos.

We may confidently state, that so far as "historical unaccountability" depends upon inharmonious events and dates, no substantial difficulty exists in assigning the Visit to Crete, and the Epistle to Titus to have been written during the last year of the residence at Ephesus.

(*To be Continued.*)

---

* Vol. 2, p. 321.

† As I understand from the 12th of November to the 9th of March.

ART. IX.—THE GREEK CHURCH.

Some Account of the Present Greek Church, compared with Jacob Goar's Notes on the Greek Ritual. By JOHN COVEL, D.D. Cambridge. 1722.

Menologium Græcorum. 1727. Astor Library.

The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia. By JOHN GLEN KING, D.D. London. 1722.

The Present State of the Greek Church in Russia. By ROBERT PINKERTON. New York. 1815.

A History of the Church of Russia. By A. N. MORAVIEFF. St. Petersburgh. 1838. London. 1842.

The Doctrine of the Russian Church. By Rev. R. W. BLACKMORE. Aberdeen. 1865.

The Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Churches of the East. Aberdeen. 1846.

A History of the Holy Eastern Church. By the Rev. JOHN MASON NEALE, M. A. London. 1850.

Dissertations on Subjects relating to the "Orthodox," or "Eastern Catholic" Communion. By WILLIAM PALMER, M. A. London. 1853.

Addresses of the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos. 1870.

MANY reasons conspired to the warmth and brilliancy of that reception of the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos which has recently so excited England. Laity, Clergy, Dignitaries, Universities, Convocations kindled with hospitable ardors. Entertainments, addresses, honors smiled along the pathway of Alexander. He emerged from the solitude and obscurity of his island-diocese into a blaze of notoriety, both dazzling and unexpected. He is a Greek; and was, therefore, seen encircled with that glow the imagination throws over a land which has achieved so much for art and literature and liberty. He is a representative of the venerable Eastern Church; and thus associated with the Creeds, and Fathers, and Martyrs, and struggles of a sacred antiquity. He is the declared foe to Roman usurpation; and now, while the Vatican Council is rearing a new barrier to Latin communion, and scattering so many splendid visions, he may prove a bright link of fellowship with

riental Christians. Perhaps had it been known that by baptizing nd ordaining an American Presbyter he had proclaimed to the 'orld that he esteemed every Anglican Layman unbaptized, every Anglican Priest unordained, and every Anglican Bishop unconse-rated, the enthusiasm of his welcome might have been somewhat chilled. As it was, the fact that by no act and in no address did he directly or impliedly recognize the equality of the English and Greek Churches, was not suffered to arrest the admiration and cordiality with which he was so universally greeted.

It is impossible not to be impressed and affected by such a re-ception. How much better, in most aspects, than the passions often nflamed by the presence of those differing in religious views! To urge what may mar and cloud such beauty of fellowship appears both invidious and dangerous. More especially is the task unwel-come when we remember how much our own wise and admirable General Convention has done to foster union with the Greek Church. Still, if this blaze of the emotions dazzles the vision un-il it becomes blinded to the sober suggestions of reason, the bril-liance of the glare should be somewhat mitigated. It is remark-able that in all the letters, and resolutions, and addresses which have accumulated in England and America until they form a dis-tinct literature, no allusion is ever made to precisely those difficul-ties which are the chief barriers to Communion. Now that the burst of Anglican enthusiasm is somewhat expended, and the elec-tricity of the atmosphere has exhausted itself in such fervent flashes, it may be proper to calmly and thoroughly examine the delicate subject. We will not touch the fact that the Greeks have never in their history for one moment recognized either English or Latin orders. While the Russian Church will admit a Roman Priest to ordination through chrism, and without the Trine immer-sion, it so happens that this very Archbishop of Syra, is so stren-uous upon this point, that *he* would insist also upon a new Bap-tism. Waiving, however, all questions of equality, or precedence we now propose to investigate kindly and impartially what the East-ern Church teaches and practices in regard to the worship of crea-tures, and the dogma of transubstantiation; and then conclude our Article by a few reflections upon these eager and passionate advances towards Communion.

The universal temptation of the race has been to idolatry. Men desire visible gods. A being seems too high for their comprehension who is unseen and spiritual; only perceptible through his Creation; withdrawn from our gaze in the mysterious depths of his Divine Nature. Mortals failing to grasp the infinite and eternal, and weary with straining into the dimness which vails omnipotence, and omniscience have always sought to embody in palpable forms that consciousness which led them to trust, and to adore. Indeed, to innocently gratify this characteristic tendency; to satisfy both our human and our divine instincts; to bring God down to man, and to bring man up to God; to unite earth to heaven, were the great purposes of our Lord's Incarnation. One of the most blasting and pernicious effects of the idolatries of Christendom is that the saint expels from the heart the Saviour, and becomes the object of that faith and adoration due to Jesus Christ.

Beyond question the aim of the Jewish dispensation and discipline was to preserve in the world the worship of Jehovah, and the expectation of His Messiah. The temptation of the Israelite was idolatry, and his test allegiance to God. His faith had to be guarded by ceremonies, by types, by laws, by mercies, by judgments, by the seclusion of years in the wilderness, by separation from the nations during centuries, and finally by a long and dreary, and cruel captivity. When Christianity burst upon the world amid the glory of the Roman Empire the test which had been applied to the disciple of Moses was virtually applied to the disciple of Christ. A grain of incense burned to Jupiter, or a kiss upon the image of the god, or an inclination before his embodied majesty, would almost invariably extinguish the fiercest flames of death. It is certainly a remarkable fact that in the days of her primitive martyrs, and noblest triumphs, Christianity recoiled with abhorrence from every approach to the worship of the creature. Still the old idolatries were in the blood and heart and life of men. The taint was derived from inheritance, and aggravated by custom. Even in the patristic writings of some of the early centuries its revived traces begin to reappear. Certain customs fostered the tendency. The very atmosphere of the world was pervaded by the infection. Soon the internal impulse answered the external temptation. The splendid efforts of Helena the mother of Constantine to make the gorgeousness of the Church correspond to the magnificence of the

Empire precipitated the result. Christendom soon resembled Paganism. The images of the ancient temple were represented n the modern Church. Idolatries of Babylon and Athens and Rome were substantially revived. Angels and Saints were invoked instead of gods and demons. Michael was substituted for Jupiter. Where the heathen supplicated Apollo, the Christian supplicated Peter. The holy Virgin took the place of the chaste Diana. Creatures whose worship is forbidden, and of whom we have no assurance that they can hear or help, were everywhere invoked, whereas the whole foundation of faith in prayer is the Scriptural revelation of the Omnipresence, and Omnipotence, and Omniscience of Jehovah. Christendom was thus debased and darkened and polluted by expending those sympathies on the saint which properly terminate in the Saviour. The edicts of Leo the Isaurian in A. D. 717, and A. D. 727 first forbidding the worship of images, and then commanding their destruction, were evidently unwise assaults upon the mere external evidences of an internal and universal corruption whose only remedy was the reformation of the heart. The efforts of Copronymus were not eventually, more successful than those of his father. Leo the Armenian, at the altar of the Church, grasping the cross as his weapon of defence, lost, first his arm, and then his life, by the violence of a rude soldier who respected neither the purple of the Empire, nor the sanctuary of his Religion, while his cruelty was simply an intensified representation of an idolatrous age. Mahommedism itself was a ghastly protest against the superstition of Christendom, which, first encouraged by the innocent zeal of Helena, was restored by the monstrous cruelties of Irene, and perpetuated by the feminine craft of Theodora. The zeal of Iconoclasm soon exhausted itself. The old idolatry finally tainted the new religion. The gloom of Mediævalism was beginning to settle over the world. In the year of our Lord 842, a solemn festival was appointed for the restoration of images. The Clergy of Constantinople, and the surrounding regions gather before the palace of the Archbishop. A vast procession moves to the Church of St. Sophia. There the Empress and her Son are ready for the pageant. With lifted crosses and blazing torches the crowd march around the Church worshiping the statues and pictures. Thus the adoration of the creature became again the practice of

Christendom. The decree of the second council of Nicæa not only declares the law, but expresses the consciousness of the age.

"With the venerable, and life-giving cross shall be set up the venerable and Holy images whether in colors, in Mosaic work, or any other material within the consecrated Churches of God, on the sacred vessels, and vestments, on the walls and tablets, on houses, and in highways. The images that is to say of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, of the immaculate mother of God; of the honored angels; of all saints and holy men. These images shall be treated as holy memorials, worshiped, kissed, only not with that peculiar adoration which is reserved for the invisible, incomprehensible God."

All violators of this asserted immemorial usage of the Church if Ecclesiastics were to be deposed and excommunicated; if monks or laymen, excommunicated. The council not only enacted the Decree but burst forth into the most passionate exclamations of approval.

"We all believe, we all assert, we all subscribe. This is the faith of the Apostles. This is the faith of the Church. This is the faith of the Orthodox. This is the faith of all the world. We who adore the Trinity worship images. Whoever does not the like anathema upon him. Anathema upon all who call images idols. Anathema on all who communicate with them who do not worship images."

It is not the purpose of our Article to discuss the abstract question involved in the Decree of Nicæa. Whatever the nature of adoration to any creature it becomes uniformly, and essentially sinful and corrupting. The ancient Roman defended supplication addressed to his statue by the very arguments the modern Greek defends worship addressed to his picture. Reasons and results in heathen and in Christian have always been identical. But our object now is to show historically by how wide, and deep a chasm the Eastern and Anglican Churches are separated by their authoritative action on this entire subject. The Greek and Latin communions have always followed in their practice the Decree of the Second Council of Nicæa. In regard to the former we shall soon give the evidence in detail. At present it is sufficient here to quote the Anathema of Orthodox Sunday which is, we believe, universal custom in the Oriental Church, and intended forever to perpetuate the triumph of image-worship obtained against Iconoclasm. On the first Sunday in Lent, over the vast regions of Russia, in Constantinople, in Jerusalem, and through the islands of

ie Mediterranean, the office for the day contains the annually reurring words.

"To the Synod that innocently condemned the holy icons anathema, anthema, anathema. To them that interpret the sayings of holy Writ against dols of the venerable icons of Christ our God, and His saints, anathema, anathema, anathema. To them that knowingly communicate with those that insult, and dishonor the venerable icons, anathema, anathema, anathema."

Now while the Greek Church accepted the Decree of Nicæa, and yearly celebrates its memory, and declares its authority, the Anglican Church has since the Reformation assumed a position precisely antagonistic. While the worship of creatures, like the interlacing roots of a forest, every where pervades the standards, the liturgies, the devotions of the Eastern Communion, and the Latin Communion, it was most marvellously eradicated from the offices, and the life, and the consciousness of the English Communion. No revolution in the habits of a people was ever more sudden, more complete, more wonderful. Whether the result is traceable to a difference of blood, or intellect, or race, or to a superior spiritual illumination, the fact remains. There is an amusing, and also startling contrast between the Anathema of Orthodox Sunday commemorating the Second Council of Nicæa, and the burning condemnations of our Homilies reciting the history of image-worship, and concluding with words which the men who have compiled some recent liturgies for English churchmen, and dared from an English chancel, and before an English congregation to invoke the shade of St. Paul, may profitably consider. We confess that its perusal has increased our admiration for the learning, the intellect, and the piety of our venerable Reformers.

"Thus you understand, well-beloved in our Saviour Christ, by the judgment of the old, learned, godly doctors of the Church, and by the ancient histories ecclesiastical agreeing to the verity of God's Word, alleged out of the Old Testament, and New, that images and image-worshipers were in the Primitive Church, which was most pure and incorrupt, abhorred and detested as abominable, and contrary to our true Religion. Finally, ye have heard what mischief and misery hath by the occasion of the sacred images fallen upon whole Christendom, besides the loss of infinite souls which is most horrible of all." "True Religion then and pleasing of God standeth not in making, setting up, painting, gilding, clothing and decking of dumb dead images, nor in kissing them, capping, kneeling, offering to them, set-

ting up of candles, hanging up of legs, arms, or whole bodies of wax before them, or praying, or asking of them, or of saints things belonging only to God to give. But all these things be vain and abominable and most damnable before God, wherefore, all such do not only bestow their money and labor in vain, but with them their pains and cost purchase to themselves God's wrath and indignation both of body and soul."

With the Anathema of Orthodox Sunday, and this quotation from our Homilies we might close this part of our subject, taking for granted that the opposition between the received Eastern, and Anglican standards was sufficiently obvious. But public attention has been awakened upon the question, and demands to be satisfied. Our age requires on every topic the entire truth. There is abroad over the world a spirit of historic honesty which deserves our admiration. Especially should a Christian never avert his gaze from facts. We are in sympathy with this ardent desire for the union of Christendom, but we wish to see it made permanent on the basis of Eternal Truth. An alliance of falsehood will vanish like a cloud. The men who desire lasting fellowship and are to be the instruments of its accomplishment, will never be controlled by an effervescent sentimentality. They will examine the subject in all its aspects. They will overcome opposing difficulty by persistent honesty. They will ever subordinate impulse to reason. Having premised this much, we are prepared to demonstrate from the offices, and the customs of the Eastern Church that its supplications to creatures are as multiplied, and objectionable as in the Roman Church. In all its services from birth to burial are the invocations of saints. They mingle in the private devotions of the people, and affect their whole lives. Icons must be kissed, and incensed and reverenced by the Priest in the celebration of the Holy Communion, and they afterwards receive homage from the congregation. The Sacramental elements are adored. But we will hasten to give the proofs accumulated by a long and laborious investigation of this subject. Our authorities run through more than a century from Covel to Neale. We might perhaps fill an entire number of the Review with these addresses, but to save space and time will extract a few petitions principally to the Holy Virgin.

"Most blessed Virgin, thou art the temple, and the gate, the palace, and the throne of the King, by whom Christ the Lord my Saviour was made

sted. Cease not thou most glorious, who hast a maternal influence with him to pray for the salvation of our souls. Hail thou impervious gate of ie Lord. Hail thou wall of protection to all who flee to thee. Hail thou ho art the peaceful haven."

"Save us, oh most holy Virgin, make thy intercession, console thy ser-ants, assuage their sufferings, cleanse their sins, and heal their sorrows."

"O thou immaculate, undefiled, incorruptible, most chaste and pure Vir-n, Sovereign Bride of God—thou who art the only hope of those who de-ond, the ready help of those who flee unto thee, the refuge of all Christians, ive mercy and compassion on me a sinner, and receive the prayers I offer ito thee with unhallowed lips—be present with me always through the unty of thy grace and kindness—defend me in this life under thy safe-iard and protection—turn aside the assaults of the enemies, and conduct e to Salvation and at the time of my departure preserve my miserable soul id drive from it all dark visions of subtle devils, deliver me in the dread-l day of judgment from eternal punishment, and make me an heir of the ispeakable glory of our God."

"Save the people, oh God, through the intercession of our most honorable ady, the mother of God, and ever-virgin Mary, through the power of the orious and life-giving Cross, through the aid of the heavenly, holy and imaculate virtues; of the venerable prophet, forerunner and baptist, John; the holy, glorious and renowned Apostles; of our holy fathers, and univer-l great Doctors, Basil the Great, Gregory the Divine, and John Chrysos-m; of St. Nicholas—of our holy Fathers the wonder-workers in all the Rus-as, Peter Alexis, Jonas and Philip, of the holy and glorious martyrs, and of l the Saints."

"O blessed Mother of God, open the gates of mercy unto those whose ope is in thee: let us not be confounded, but grant that through thee we ay be delivered from affliction, for thou art the Salvation of the Christian ice."

"Having transgressed the commands of God, we are turned into dust, but aving shaken off the corruption of death, through thee, O Virgin, we are ised from earth to heaven."

We will perceive in these addresses that Mary is supplicated by very term which could be applied to our Lord. She is made the rength, the refuge, the help, the hope, the salvation of the Sin-er. The frequent recurrence of her name, and the cherished resence of her image must always expel from the consciousness of ie Greek Christian the conception of that mediation of her Divine on by which alone the Scripture authorizes us to approach the iternal Father. A more effectual idolatry can scarcely be con-eived. The conclusion from the various offices we have exam-ned is inevitable, that remembrances and intercessions of Saints ire interwoven with every part of the lives of those vast nations which compose the Eastern Church, and the testimony of observa-

tion to the fact is unquestionable. The learned and exhaustive treatise of Neale, is the most recent and reliable authority upon the subject, and in no Latin office are these addresses more objectionable than those we will now quote from the Menœa as given in his interesting pages.

"Virgin, blessed of God, as a benevolent advocate thou art proclaimed by the faithful, Mother of God, presenting our prayers to the Creator, procure propitiation for thy servants, as the all-sufficient salvation and propitiation of our souls."

"O thou noble athletes that had fellowship with God, and were enlightened by the divine rays, illuminate my soul, wash out the filth of our passions with the pure dews of your healings."

"At thy intercession, O spotless Virgin to the Word that was born of thee loose me from the bands of my sins, and save me lady by thy prayers."

"Joyously hath the holy and illustrious memory of the martyrs dawned upon us, enlightening the whole earth, dispersing the darkness of malice, driving away the clouds of the soul, and pouring forth the graces of healing. O athletes with bloody drops and wearing beautifully this purple, most celebrated ones, you reign forever with Christ our only King and God interceding for the world. Ever blessed is the earth with your blood, and the depositum of your robes and the Church of the first-born is gloriously illustrated with your wounds. In the which for the martyrs as martyrs supplicate for the world."

We now leave this part of the subject, and proceed to show in what way the Eastern Church receives the doctrine of Transubstantiation. But first a general remark is required. Modern controversialists have an exceedingly weak method of evading the obligatory power of authoritative standards. Certainly when a formula is discussed and adopted and promulgated, we cannot escape its binding force by exhibiting the difficulties and disagreements it previously encountered. In this precise manner the great Œcumenical Creeds are assaulted by their enemies. The stormy sessions of even the Council of Nicæa are not agreeable subjects of contemplation. Eternal Truth assumed her divine shape amid the most terrible conflicts of passion. Yet the Creed, in its simple majesty emerging from these tempests, with the sanction of the Universal Church, passes into her consciousness and is obligatory on our conscience without regard to the factions amid which it had birth. And similarly with regard to the Anglican and American standards. The time has passed for inquiries as to the disputes and parties preceding their adoption. Having received the impress of the prop-

uthority they henceforth come to us with the solemn sanctions of ıw. And the same is true in regard to the acknowledged confes-ons and councils of the Eastern Church. They indeed assumed ıeir present form under some degree of Latin influence. Perhaps ıey may have originated in a selfish desire to please the Pope, nd obtain the privilege of access to the tomb of our Lord, and ıe holy places about Jerusalem. It may be also true that indi-dual Prelates, with superior intellectual advantages and spiritual lumination seek to effect their reform, or evade their obligation. till, if they have been adopted by the Church, if they control the ractice of the Church, if they have become the law of the Church ıd have entered into the very life of the Church, they can be our ıly guides when considering terms of communion, just as in any actical arrangement on the subject, the Orientals would be gov-ned by our own Liturgy, and Articles, not by our dreary and dious and partisan discussions of their origin and history.

With these preliminary remarks we approach "THE ORTHODOX ONFESSION OF THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH." It was st composed as an exposition of Eastern doctrine by Peter Mogila, etropolitan of Kieff, and one of the most distinguished Russian ivines. In the year A. D. 1643 it was revised by the Council of ıssy. Then it was authenticated by the signatures of the four atriarchs, and according to Neale has become a "standard of octrine" in the Eastern Church. Nectarius, Patriarch of Con-antinople, prefaced it by a letter giving its history. It has been pproved by Parthenius of Constantinople, Macarius of Antioch, asius of Jerusalem. Besides, there are attached to it the names f the Metropolitans, or Bishops of Ancyra, Larissa, Chalcedon, drianople, Rhodes, Methymene, Chios, and of thirteen Ecclesias-ics of the great Church. We will remark here the use of the dis-inctive Greek word, and of the very terms employed by the Latins. In the exposition of the Sixth Article of Faith and of the Eucharist is language which needs no comment.

"Christ as to His Flesh, which He bore, is only in Heaven, and not upon rth, except when He is mystically in the Eucharist,—κατα μετουσιωσιν—by RANSUBSTANTIATION, when the substance of the bread is changed into the bstance of His body, and the substance of the wine into the substance of is blood, and therefore, we ought to glorify and worship the Eucharist in te manner as we worship our Saviour Jesus Himself."

Here is that very assertion in regard to substance, which, according to Dr. Pusey, characterizes the difference between the carnal Roman view and the spiritual Anglican doctrine. The obligation of adoration to the elements demonstrates the significance of the Exposition. It is easily inferable from the expressions of this standard what is intended by the Bishop's oath at Consecration.

"I believe, and understand that the TRANSUBSTANTIATION of the body and blood of Christ is effected by the influence and operation of the Holy Ghost, when the Bishop or Priest invokes God the Father in these words: 'And make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ.'"

The declarations of the Council at Bethlehem are even yet more explicit than the "Orthodox Confession." This Synod was assembled A. D. 1672. Its Articles, according to Blackmore, were first formally communicated to the Russian Church A. D. 1721, and sent to the English Church in that year as an ultimatum. They are interesting, because thus invested by a peculiar authority, and also as venerable evidences of pious but fruitless efforts towards union nearly two centuries since. An explicitness and detail will also be remarked more labored, and anxious than even the Canon of Trent. Besides, it is most grossly asserted that the body of our Saviour is received into the mouth, and passed down into the organs of digestion.

"We believe that in the celebration of this mystery, our Lord Jesus Christ is present, not in a figurative, or imaginary manner, nor by any excellency of grace, as some of the Fathers have said of Baptism, nor by impanation, nor by the substantial union of the Divinity of the Word with the bread that is set upon the altar, as the Lutherans ignorantly, and wretchedly think, but really, and indeed, so that after the consecration of the bread, the bread is changed, and transubstantiated, transformed into the very Body and Blood of our Lord, which was born in Bethlehem of the most pure Virgin, baptized in the river Jordan, suffered, was buried, rose again, ascended into Heaven, sitteth on the right hand of the Father, shall come again in the clouds of Heaven; and that the wine is converted, and transubstantiated into the very true Blood of the Lord, which was shed for the life of the world when He suffered on the Cross. *Further we believe, that after the consecration of the bread and wine, the very bread and wine no longer remain, but the very Body and Blood of our Lord are distributed, and enter into the mouths and stomachs of the communicants.*"

With the last repulsive statement of the Council of Bethlehem we close our extracts from Eastern offices, and Eastern standards

Waiving all questions touching the interpolation of the Nicene Creed, and the recognition of Anglican Orders, no pious desire for a united Christendom can blind us to differences relating to the error of Transubstantiation, and the worship of creatures. And taking for granted as demonstrated that the infection of superstition has diffused itself through the Oriental Church, we cannot but ask ourselves how it will be affected by this enthusiasm of welcome, which has brightened around one of its most lordly and magnificent and aspiring dignitaries? The telegraph from London doubtless kept flashing the joyous news to every part of the Orient. Such inspiring intelligence must have kindled unknown gratulation in St. Petersburgh, and Moscow, and Athens, and Constantinople, and Jerusalem, and over the Mediterranean Isles, and all the vast regions under the shadow of the venerable Eastern Church. To people, Priests, Bishops, Metropolitans, Patriarchs, it must have seemed the auspicious harbinger of Anglican submission to an acknowledged Oriental superiority. True, there was no formal ecclesiastic recognition, but the desire for union, without regard to conditions or standards, for the moment burst over every barrier. Now supposing the Homilies on Idolatry, adopted by the English Articles, and hence subscribed by English clergymen are true, how can the English Church, without abandoning her own solemn and recorded Protests, perform any act which shall encourage Eastern Christians in superstitious belief, or practice? When these perceive such an indiscriminating anxiety, and such a forgetful approbation; when they see their representative feasted by the dignitaries of London, and honored by the scholars of Oxford; when they hear that Archiepiscopal delegates were commissioned to watch his Oriental splendors sparkle over the consecrated altar, they can only feel that there is an intended oblivion of past differences, and be encouraged in the worship of the saint, and the adoration of the host. The effect on the whole communion may be read in the effect upon Alexander himself. A Greek paper states he asserted that Anglicans, feeling their weakness, and recoiling from Latin usurpation, were seeking a centre of support in the Holy Eastern Church. Certainly, however, amid all the brilliance of the late reception both parties must have been secretly conscious that beneath the glare was a concealed hollowness. Or are the English Homilies, like the Miracles and Mysteries of

our Religion, to be henceforth regarded as myths? Perhaps the Articles which authorize their burning protests are the relics of a forgotten age. What was once condemned superstition is now lawful worship. The adoration of the creature, which was damnation in the sixteenth century, is salvation in the nineteenth century.

But we must inquire moreover, what is the impression produced by the adulation shown Alexander upon the Anglican Church herself. We gave in a former number of this Review a demonstration that there were in her midst a few extremists who proclaimed their belief in Transubstantiation and encouraged supplication to the saints. Their prayers of invocation were then confined to private offices. Recently we are told a petition in the public congregation has ascended to the spirit of St. Paul. Is it not to be feared that this confined tendency may be fostered and enlarged by a welcome which could only make the Orientals cling more closely to their ancient and cherished superstitions? When we read the strong rebukes of the Homilies and the distinct protests of the Articles; when we remember that idolatries by our fathers were resisted unto chains, unto blood, unto fire; when we reflect what clergymen have publicly written, and preached, and practiced, without reproof, or punishment, we cannot but fear, that in the glow of a mere sentimentalism, the instincts of the Church have been blunted in regard to the indignant rebukes of her own standards, and the terrible denunciation of the Scriptures. What was true in the day of Moses, and true in the day of Cranmer is true in the day of the Archbishop of Syra.

Nor can we forget in all our public acts their effect on bodies of Christians rejecting Episcopal ordination. To those, as we shall show hereafter, no concession of principle can be made, yet, we cannot overlook the fact that while many have been gained from our Communion to Rome, and few from Rome to our Communion, that we are yet constantly increasing from the ranks of the most influential denominations. Recently a remarkable discourse from a Congregational pulpit has been scattered over our country by our own press, and is showing how thoughtful men are impressed by our conservative genius, our venerable antiquity, and our majestic Liturgy. These are steps in the process towards a belief in our Divine Institution, and our Episcopal Order. Clergymen most

highly gifted, and cultivated, having passed these preliminary gradations, are thoughtfully abandoning positions of influence, and emolument, and submitting to the hands of our Bishops. Every alliance with Mediævalism, which concedes the protests of our Homilies, and our Articles is an unlawful barrier in the path of such honest inquirers for the peace, and order and security of the ONE HOLY CATHOLIC and APOSTOLIC CHURCH. While fruitless in producing union in one direction it is shutting the door of access in another direction.

Besides in all that has been said, and written in regard to unifying Christendom it is taken for granted that our differences merely lie in Creeds, and Confessions, and Articles. They are infinitely deeper. They spring moreover from inheritance. They flow in the blood. They are perpetuated in the daily customs, which mark the private and public lives of men belonging to vast nations. They involve distinctions between great races. They connect themselves with contrarieties in the imaginative genius of the Oriental and the dominating genius of the Latin, and the overmastering genius of the Saxon. Scholars in the retirement of collegiate retreats, and Clergymen in the resolutions of public assemblies, cannot by paring away standards, and extending hospitalities, remove the barriers of centuries.

Is the hope of unity then to be forever abandoned? Shall these bright visions of love be dissipated like the clouds of a morning? Shall we retreat again into the dismal realms of an icy selfishness, and despair? We answer, never. *Let us find the basis of a true unity in our own Prayer-Book* viewed as a substantial reproduction of the Primitive Church by the English Reformation. But we are not to mutilate its parts. We are not to set Liturgy, against Articles, and Articles against Liturgy. We are to accept, to believe, to glory in its entirety if not its details, as the authorized interpretation of the Holy Scripture by the Holy Church. We are to receive its great teaching in regard to Order and Doctrine, and Sacraments and boldly proclaim it to the world as the depositum of a common Faith, the symbol of a common Worship, and the pledge of a common fellowship for Christendom. Relying on Truth and God, our Christian manhood must neither lean on the senile decrepitude of Mediæval communions, or depend on the wild vigor of denominational bodies. It is not ours to seek from others the

staff of tottering age, or the support of lawless youth. We declare God has committed to our earthen vessel a Heavenly Treasure. We say to that part of unreformed Christendom having a true ecclesiastical Order, "The Holy Ghost, in the morning of the Reformation poured upon the eyes of our Anglican Fathers the bright light of the Apostolic Church, and placed before their gaze its Divine Model. Renounce the mediæval dogma of Transubstantiation! Abandon your supplication to images, and your worship to saints! Quench your purgatorial fires! Close your compulsory confessional! Cease your unauthorized indulgences! Take the chain from the Bible! Content with Papal Primacy, yield Papal Supremacy, and Papal infallibility. Accept the English Reformation of the sixteenth century, in its great aspects, as a reproduction of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church as instituted by Jesus Christ our common Lord, and you contribute peace to Christendom."

Any other position is an eternal discord with our genius, our history, and our standards. Articles, Homilies, and Martyrdoms rise up in protest against every departure from such essential conditions in the direction of a forced and unnatural and impossible unity.

On the contrary, let us honestly say to that part of reformed Christendom rejecting a true ecclesiastical Order, "We rejoice that to so great an extent you have retained the orthodox doctrines of the Scriptures. We respect your sincerity. We admire your zeal. We commend your works. We esteem your piety. We are glad that on so many points we agree and sympathize. But we must be honest. The declaration of our ordinal, the requirements of our canons, the exclusiveness of our pulpits are proof to all the world, that we believe in the necessity of Episcopal Ordination to a valid ministry. You trace your visible organization to some distinguished man, while we trace our visible organization to our Divine Lord. We believe the Holy Ghost regenerates in Baptism the dedicated infant and the penitent believer, while you usually deny the doctrine. We would feast spiritually by faith on the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ present to the soul in the Holy Communion, while you too often regard such a view of the Eucharist as inseparable from Transubstantiation. We hold these truths as Scriptural, as Apostolic, as Catholic, and when

ou accept them in heart and practice, you contribute peace to hristendom."

We appeal to the consciousness of every Churchman whether his is not our true position before God, and man. England finds his conception limited, and fettered by connection with the State. n our own country it is left to its free development. Let it be lazoned on our American standards. Let it be preached by our ishops, proclaimed by our Clergymen, believed by our people, acnowledged by our General Convention. Let it force all rebellious xtremes to bow before the majesty of law. It will be our strength, ir glory, our victory. It will send a thrill through America. It ill prove a power over the world. If ever Christendom be united, e repeat, it must be on the basis of our Prayer-Book given to the orld by our Fathers as a mirror of the Primitive Church—altera-e, when expedient, in its details, but *never* in its CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

We know this is rejected as a narrow view, and that it too often wakes scorn, and ridicule, and hatred. Alarmed by assaults of rejudice on either hand, it is to be feared the Church has not yet sen to the lofty position of her venerable standards. And it is r this very reason we make ourselves liable to the taunt that we e but a small, rich, aristocratic sect, great in pretensions, and lite in achievement. One party to demonstrate its Catholicity afcts Rome, and the other party to demonstrate its Catholicity afcts Sectism. Catholicity is not in such courses. Catholicity is the Creed, in the heart, in the life. Catholicity shows itself by e largeness of its spirit, the largeness of its faith, and the largeess of its effort. That Catholicity which would bring Mediæval hristianity through the fires of another Reformation, and bring enominationalism to the recognition of Episcopal Order, and bring world into the Apostolic Church, can never be reproached for a ntracting bigotry. It resembles the universal air which sinking to the valley, and enfolding the mountain, embraces our globe.

Nor is the widest Catholicity inconsistent with a certain respect e our Saxon race. The Greeks, indeed, extend their shadow er vast and venerable regions. Memory connects them in the st with Attic culture and Spartan heroism. Their Patriarch ill lingers around St. Sophia waiting in hope for the day when t the crescent, but the cross will gleam over Constantinople.

The sacred soil of Judea, and the boundless regions of Russia are the witnesses of their rites, while their very name is associated with the original language of the New Testament, and of the Nicene Creed, and of a long line of erudite Fathers. The Latins, extending their sway from imperial Rome as a centre, exert a moulding power over nations in every part of the world, and perpetuate the glory of the ancient city and empire in the stately magnificence of St. Peter's and the unrivalled autocracy of the Pope. These Churches have over wide territories and among multiplied millions preserved and spread the essential truths of Christianity. But they have also added to them numerous corrupting dogmas, and practices. They exhibit a diffused mediævalism. They are allied to a fossilized past. They are alienated from the sympathies of the age. They have placed themselves as barriers across the path of modern civilization. They are hostile to the genius of that progress which is bringing the world to knowledge and liberty and the Gospel. They need the new life infused by the Reformation of the Sixteenth century, and from which has sprung the truest glory of our humanity. On the contrary, the Anglican Church, purified in the fires of martyrdom, has stood forth for a grander mission, having had most largely under her control that vigorous Saxon race whose work has been to extend over the globe with the English language, Truth and Freedom in their noblest forms. She has displayed in her career both conservatism and progress. She has preserved what was most valuable in the Past, and should keep herself in sympathy with the Present, that she may conquer the Future. She can directly and indirectly claim those intellects and those achievements, which, in Britain and America have most impressed our age, and conferred on civilization all that is most useful in possession, and most brilliant in promise. Now shall the Church of that land which has thus illumined our humanity humiliate herself herself before these Mediæval Communions, isolated from modern ideas, and *beg* of them recognition and fellowship? Shall she who should be the teacher, assume the attitude of the pupil? Shall she whose limbs were unfettered by the Reformation again seek the manacles of her dungeon? Shall she who has not only the Apostolic Order but the Scriptural Faith, with importuning gaze, place herself as a suppliant before venerable communions who have overlaid truth

with superstitition, and who impose practices and conditions, and dogmas on the world wholly unknown to Primitive Christianity? Such a course sacrifices her dignity, degrades her position, destroys her influence, and falsifies her mission. It is indeed treason to the race, and to the age, as well as to her destiny.

Wisdom would seem to teach that the Anglican Church, considering the Reformation as a revival of pure Christianity, caught and fixed in her Liturgy, and her Articles should not exhibit a restless and puerile haste for unity, but watch those germs of progress which are gradually appearing both in the Greek Church and the Latin Church. Every man like the late learned, and pious and gifted Philaret of Moscow must be a centre of light, and emit beams which are bright harbingers of a coming illumination. We have reason to believe that there are many Ecclesiastics and Laymen among the Orientals who deplore the ignorance of the clergy and the superstition of the people. In the Roman Church, the Pope, and his Jesuits have evidently alienated themselves forever from the genius of the period, and Döllinger, and Gratry and Hyacinthe, and the most gifted spirits of the communion, are perhaps unconsciously shaping a Reformation, which may exhibit the restorative power of the sixteenth century without its excesses and defects. Now Anglicans should foster these tendencies. They should cherish intimacy with these heroic men. They should spread the knowledge of their principles. They should above all supplicate the power of the Holy Ghost, whose fires can consume mountains of opposition, and whose breath alone can create a new world of light, and love, and beauty. Then, when the Eastern Church and the Western Church, by the Providence and Spirit of God, have been purified and reformed, there will be a prospect of solid and enduring union with the Anglican Church, while all denominations of Christians, impressed with such a spectacle of restored unity might be irresistibly impelled to their fellowship, and give to the world a triumphant Christianity. And thus might be realized a true Ecumenical Council—that cherished vision of pious souls—which would be a prophecy and pledge of millenial light and victory. An attempt to assemble such a body without a deep and searching process, which should penetrate and revolutionize the opinions, the observances, the customs of vast nations and races, would be adding confusion to chaos. Our Divine Head does not permit Greeks, and Romans, and Anglicans to meet when

their disputes in regard to precedence, and orders, and dogmas, and practices would tear the world in pieces. He does not allow before the age such a strife of passions as could only find its equal in the blaze of Pandemonium. He does not suffer truth to be blackened and disfigured while infidels laugh and demons mock. But on the contrary, when our prayers and efforts achieve the needed Reform; when the circumstances of the world without, and the impulse of the Church within are brought into harmony; when the hour arrives not hastened by the restless impatience of man, but appointed in the eternal plans of Jehovah, then an Ecumenical Council will prove the unity of Christendom. Even sectarianism may seek repose under its tranquil shadow. The Pope, vacating his temporal throne, repudiating his forged decretals, abjuring his pretended supremacy, abandoning his fancied infallibility may find yielded to him his lawful precedence, until at last, when believing Israel is gathered home, the later superiority of imperial Rome yields to the primitive primacy of venerable Jerusalem restored in the millenial era of the "One Holy Catholic, and Apostolic Church."

Such a future seems indeed distant. It presumes faith and works and prayer. It is not attractive to a shallow sentimentalism. It is not stimulating in the speeches of dinner-parties, and the resolutions of assemblies. It is not exhilarating to excitable youth. It may not kindle such a blaze of hospitalities as brightened over England. But to secure such a result is the inspiring work of the noblest Christian manhood. Let all brave spirits in both the Anglican and the American Church pledge themselves before heaven to seek its consummation. Yet must it always be remembered that the union of gigantic communions severed during centuries by antagonisms of race, and of opinion, and of custom must be necessarily gradual if it would be certainly enduring. Those barriers of sands and rocks which separate oceans, have stood for ages across the path of commerce, and must yield slowly to the advances of humanity, but bold faith and persistent labor will finally subdue their resistance, and over mingling waters will be an unobstructed highway for the nations. Thus in the time and plan of God may we indulge the hope that the mountains dividing Christendom will be leveled, and all sections of the ONE HOLY CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH flow together in a universal fellowship, the type and pledge of an Eternal Communion.

BOOK NOTICES.

s BY HENRY MELVILL, B. D., *Minister of Camden Chapel, Cam-*
, and Chaplain to the Tower of London. Formerly Fellow and Tutor of
r's College, Cambridge. Comprising all the Discourses published by the
of the Author; Edited by the Right Reverend C. P. McIlvaine, D.D.,
of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio. In two
, Eleventh thousand. James Miller, Publisher, 647 *Broadway, New*

qualities seem essential to distinguished excellence in the pulpit.
t necessary is to have head, and heart and life pervaded and con-
y the Gospel. It must be imbibed like the atmosphere, which en-
rough the lungs into the blood, becomes incorporated with every
he body. If the preacher has not his whole nature rooted in the
c Faith he is soon detected and exposed by the consciousness of the
Some unsubdued temper, some casual expression, some unguarded
inevitably betray his unsoundness and laxity. But there are
r, needed the intellectual grasp of great principles, and that ardor of
d of temperament which can present truth in attractive and com-
forms. How far the accomplishments of elocution are requisite is
o determine. These are unquestionably found in popular orators
itefield, and Summerfield; but Edwards and Chalmers have pro-
reat effects in defiance of all the rules of art, and the manner of
is characterized by the most striking defects. His frame is feeble.
t labors. His delivery is exhausting. He seems like a soul always
burst the body. In the very midst of his discourse he stops for
nd the pause is equally a relief to his own quivering frame, and
athetic audience. Yet despite his vehement and even painful de-
ere is in Melvill a resistless power. His soul is charged with the
the Gospel like a battery with electricity, and the subtle influence
nicated to the spirits of his audience. His intellect is large. His
ion is brilliant. His ardor is intense. His style is strong and fer-
picturesque. Often he seems to glow with the inspiration of a
Indeed you cannot account on natural principles for the effects
scourses, and are compelled to the conclusion that in the sanctity
set he has drawn down on himself, and his hearers, that unction of
Ghost which is after all the mightiest impulse of the pulpit. Mel-
often almost the gorgeousness and greatness of Chalmers, with far
t satisfies the heart, and affects the life of the Christian. Next to
re prefer him to any modern preacher. He is not indeed a model
ocrity, but notwithstanding obvious defects, he is a proof to the
that intellectual and spiritual superiority which constitutes one of
ices and attractions of the Church. Before giving a single quota-
hibit the characteristic style of Melvill, we remark that one ex-

cellence of his sermons is, that he abounds in simple, but most interesting and impressive Scriptural exposition. We must, however, hasten to the extract taken from the Sermon entitled:—"THE HUMILIATION OF THE MAN, CHRIST JESUS."

"It must be blasphemous to speak of properties of Godhead as laid aside, or even suspended. But Christ 'emptied himself' of the glories and majesties to which he had claim, and which, as he sat on the throne of the heavens, he possessed in unmeasured abundance. Whatsoever he was as to nature and essence, whilst appearing among the angels in the form of God, that he continued to be still, when, in the form of a servant, he walked the scenes of human habitation. But then the *glories* of the form of God, these for a while he altogether abandoned. If, indeed, he had appeared upon earth—as, according to the dignity of his nature, he had a right to appear—in the majesty and glory of the Highest, it might be hard to understand what riches had been lost by divinity. The scene of display would have been changed. But the splendor of display being unshorn and undiminished, the armies of the sky might have congregated round the Mediator, and given in their full tale of homage and admiration. But oh, it was poverty that the Creator should be moving on a province of his own empire, and yet not be recognized, or confessed by his creatures. It was poverty that, when he walked amongst men, scattering blessings as he trode, the anthem of praise floated not around him, and the air was often burdened with the curse, and the blasphemy. It was poverty that as he passed to and fro through the tribes whom he had made, and whom he had come down to redeem, scarce a solitary voice called him blessed, scarce a solitary hand was stretched in friendship, and scarce a solitary roof ever proffered him shelter. And when you contrast this deep and desolate poverty with that exuberant wealth which had always been his own whilst heaven continued the scene of his manifestations—a wealth of the anthem-peal of ecstasy from a million rich voices, and of the solemn bowing down of sparkling multitudes, and of the glowing homage of immortal hierarchies, whensoever he showed forth his power, or his purposes—ye cannot fail to perceive that, in taking upon him flesh, the Eternal Son descended most literally from abundance to want, and that, though he continued just as mighty as before, just as infinitely gifted with all the stores and resources of essential divinity the transition was so total from the reaping in of glory from the whole field of the universe to the receiving comparatively nothing of his revenues of honor, that we may assert without reserve that He who was rich, for our sakes, became poor. 'In the form of God' he had acted as it were, visibly amid the enraptured plaudits of angel and archangel, cherubim and seraphim. But now in the form of man, he must be withdrawn from the delighted inspection of the occupants of heaven, and act as powerfully indeed as before, but mysteriously and invisibly, behind a dark curtain of flesh, and on the dreary platform of a sin-burdened territory."

In Discourses of Melvill edited by the venerable Bishop of Ohio, we are also pleased to find not only great and glowing declarations of the Salvation of the Gospel, but unequivocal tokens of recognition of the Church. Surely of all men, he who most distinctly acknowledges the divinity of her Institution, and the power of her Sacraments, and the inviolability of her Order, should also most effectually proclaim that holy Faith of which she is the guardian, and the witness. We will dismiss these volumes with some quotations, that, connected with our previous extract, will illustrate our meaning, and not involve the tediousness of comment.

'He has provided, by keeping up a succession of men who derive authority, in un-

ies from the first teachers of the faith, for the continued preaching of his administration of his Sacraments. And thus he hath been all along the great f His Church; delegating, indeed, power to inferior ministers who 'have the ı earthen vessels,' but superintending their appointments, as the universal d evangelizing, so to speak, his vast Diocese through their instrumentality. d that you have no true idea of a Church, unless you thus recognize in its or- ıot merely the institution of Christ, but His actual and energizing Presence."

ırcely know anything more true or more churchly than what fol-

ill not now speak of Baptism, because, full of virtue as we believe that or- be, it is only partaken of once, and that in our infancy, so that we do not go up stuary to be sprinkled with its *regenerating* waters. But the other Sacrament anity, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is, we believe, the *chief instituted piritual sustenance*, and in this we are continually invited by the Church to ı. It is difficult to speak of this Sacrament without using terms which may ɔ the being misunderstood, or misinterpreted. But we must not refrain, on nt, from expressing our sense of the awful majesty of the ordinance, and of ınefits it conveys to the faithful communicant. We do not, we cannot regard and the wine merely as signs and emblems, we rather consider them as be- *ough the act of consecration, in some most efficient though spiritual sense, the Body of our Saviour, and as such the vehicles of grace to the soul of the believer.*"

l's fine taste and fervid fancy and cultivated soul could not be in- ɔ the influences produced by Architecture. How beautifully he ı his sentiments!

he building will have its effect, so that they are much to be blamed who hold nimportant whether Churches be mean, or magnificent structures. Who has onscious of the power of a Cathedral, the power to excite lofty emotions, and oughts? a power as though arch and pillar were indeed haunted by Deity, sing, and spirit-stirring are they as they surround and canopy the worship- he stately trunks and sheltering boughs of a forest from whose depths come nces of God?"

ɔw we cannot refrain from remarking that the publication of this ɔy the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Ohio, seems a harbinger of peace. In ce he indeed says that he is "not prepared to concur with its au- ɔme minor thoughts, and incidental ideas," and thus virtually en- e views of Melvill on these fundamental questions touching the Or- Sacraments of the Church. Such expressions of opinion by the ɪxpounder of evangelical doctrines in America show how consist- ı scheme which has for its centre faith in the atonement of our In- God may be held in connection with the Apostolic Succession, Re- ɔn in Baptism, and a belief that the Holy Communion is the "chief l means of spiritual sustenance," so that the emblems "become the act of consecration in some most efficient though *spiritual* sense, and Blood of our Saviour, and as such the vehicles of grace to of the believer." These sermons of Melvill as approved by Bishop ıe, should be the basis of a true internal unity in the American

SERMONS PREACHED IN ST. JAMES' CHAPEL, YORK STREET, LONDON. *By the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, M. A., Honorary Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.* Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869.

Here we have a volume of Sermons by a Clergyman of the Church of England almost in the style of American Unitarianism. You might expect such discourses in the pulpit of Dr. Bellows. The position of Mr. Frothingham may be reached after a few years in the descending scale. Yet it must not be inferred that there is anything irreverential in the spirit, or offensive in the expressions of Mr. Brooke; on the contrary, the style while frequently sharp and incisive, is also frequently delicate, and touching, and in several instances glows into the impassioned, and the eloquent. Indeed the earnestness of a sincere soul pervades this volume which constantly moves your sad sympathies even painfully, until you find yourself borne along encircled by a spell. What is the secret of your fascination, and your sorrow? The answer is not difficult. In the Church of England, whose Faith expressed in her Creeds and Offices and Articles, is fixed as the foundations and pillars of her venerable Cathedrals, so that every worshiper through the death of our Divine Lord, and the grace of the Holy Ghost may approach with filial confidence the throne of the Eternal Father, you find a Clergyman of brilliant gifts, and seemingly sincere, who has vowed his life in defence of the Truth, instead of standing immovably in his Christian principles, as the walls of the majestic edifice devoted to Jesus Christ, is a doubtful inquirer, himself needing instruction in fundamental doctrines, wandering uncertainly about the altar, and discoursing confusedly from the pulpit. Mr. Brooke has indeed studied the age. He has given attention to science. He is in sympathy with the present. But he has adopted a theory, fatal to his peace and power, that the supernatural of the Scripture is a relic of a fossilized past. He has cut himself loose from the fixed Faith of the Church, and is drifting on towards that wide sea of German Rationalism, where so many gifted spirits have been wrecked, and from which some in this country, long tossed around in its whirling circles, are emerging into peace, and hope. His sermons evince a deep evil of the times. Viewed in connection with the appointment of Dr. Temple they are startling. When Unitarians exult in the consecration of an English Bishop, and publish the Discourses of an English Clergyman we know assuredly how they regard certain elements in the English Church. We fear in our own country there are a few men most respectable for talent, and culture, and piety, who, while at present orthodox, yet have a certain secret sympathy with the bold and progressive spirit of Anglican Rationalism, and who innocently assuming its party-name, may find themselves in a false position, and be at last compelled into its party-associations, and its party-principles. Having spoken thus freely we propose making a few extracts from these sermons of Mr. Brooke both to show the beauty of his style, and the truth of our assertions. In the Discourse on "The Denial of St. Peter," with occasional approaches to sentimentalism, there are often great felicity and power. Before proceeding to the exceptionable passages we give the following:

"Blessed is he whose life has been pure, on whom the stars smile with the same smile with which they greeted his boyhood, from whom the sea hides no dark memories, in whose ear music is always sweet, who can revisit after years the haunts of the past, and no ghastly phantom come to bring back the exiled memory of guilt to chill his blood, and sear his brain. For there is nothing really dead in this world. You have buried your sin! but it is only buried as the hurried murderer buries the corpse of his victim, with a thin layer of light sand. You pass it by and inadvertently tread upon its grave. A skeleton arm starts up, and points to heaven, and to you. There is nothing really forgotten. One touch, one sound, one sight, the murmur of a stream, a breaking wave, the sound of a church-bell, the barking of a dog heard in the still evening from a hill, a green path in the wood with the sunlight glinting on it, the way of the moon upon the waters, may at certain moments, turn the heart to stone, and fill life with a concentrated agony of remorse. Immediately the cock crew. *Then* Peter remembered the word of the Lord, and he went out, and wept bitterly. The second circumstance which pierced the heart of Peter was the look of Christ. It is probable that at the very moment when Peter raised his voice in cursing, Jesus was led out of the hall of Caiaphas, and through the court. He heard His disciple's last denial and the crowing of the cock. 'Thou too, who wouldst die with me, thou deniest: thou the man of rock, my friend, my follower.' The silent glance was vocal with regret and love, and Peter saw the miserable depth of his fall in the look of Christ, saw there, not the reproach of anger, but the reproach of tenderness. The arrow of that look went deep. His heart was broken with pain. He feared no more his enemies, nor danger, nor yet death, for in his own heart he bore a pang deeper than death could give. 'He went out and wept bitterly.' Bitter tears they were; but they made him a new man. It was the moment of Peter's true conversion. We have seen him impetuous and brave, but self-confident and imprudent. We have seen him eager in love and anger, but drifting into neglect of friendship, and passing into dishonor. We have seen him as leader of the Apostolic group, confessing Christ as the Son of God, and when the hour of trial came, denying Christ as Master and Friend. We see him now broken in spirit, self-shamed, fallen from his high estate, alone and desolate in heart, leaning against the wall, in the bitter dawn of the spring-morning, his whole frame shaken with the weeping of a heroic man. Yes! heroic, for Peter was greater than he had ever been as yet. He passed in those awful tears from a state of childhood to a state of manhood. It is strange how little we imagine in our youth, when the path of life is woven of the sun-beam, and the rainbow, how deeply and bitterly we may yet weep in after life. But till those tears, or their equivalent come on us we are not men, but children. Life has not opened to us its terrible but dignifying secrets. We have not yet trodden the inner shrine, the portal of which is kept by sacred sorrows. This was the hour which had now come to St. Peter. "A deep distress had humanized his soul." A deep sorrow had begun within the formation of a new character strong as a rock, on which his brethren, and the Church were to repose. A spiritual convulsion had revolutionized his life and made him into a man."

Now we are compelled to turn from so much truthfulness in thought and felicity in expression to another picture. Mr. Brooke, without a single appeal to Scripture, simply through his own individual sympathies and preferences, adopts the Restorationism of Origen, condemned by the Catholic Church, and discourses precisely in the style of a Universalist preacher.

"Is that work ever to cease?" "Yes," answer some; "it will cease when all the redeemed are gathered in, when the number of the elect is complete." And where are the rest, we ask, the million who have not reached your elect-standard? "They are in hell forever," is the reply, deepening in evil, baffled revenge and hate, consuming and ruinous despair, growing darker and fiercer against God the good, from day to day of

everlasting punishment. Is that the cessation of God's work? Is that the result of the magnificent work of Christ? Is that the lame and impotent conclusion of the organization of the Church of Christ? Is that the end of the war against evil? Then I can say that it seems no triumph at all to me, but ignominious defeat. Then good is not omnipotent; for it is impotent to root out evil. Then love is not lord of all, for it cannot conquer hatred. What blessedness have I in heaven, if my brethren are forever doomed to hell? It is no heaven to me; I have no union of spirit with God. I feel as the old Frank warrior felt when he came to baptism. "Where are my ancestors?" "In hell forever," said the priest. "Then I prefer to join them."

Surely you might imagine this a Discourse of Dr. Chapin. We cannot conceive how a man, apparently so ingenuous as Mr. Brooke, can say the words of the Litany, "from thy wrath and from *everlasting* damnation," or of the Burial office, "deliver us not into the bitter pains of *eternal* death," and not feel that he is falsifying the doctrines he has sworn to defend, and insulting the Church from which he derives his support.

Of course with a denial of endless punishment to the wicked, goes a denial of the Atonement of our Lord. A few sentences from Mr. Brooke will show those logical necessities by which one error produces another in inevitable sequence:

"There are not a few who still blindly think that suffering proves God's anger. Has the Cross taught us nothing better than that, revealed to us no hidden secret? Not the explanation given by a fierce theology, that there we see God's necessary anger expended on a surety, but the healing truth that there God's love died for the sake of man, and that the self-sacrifice did not expiate wrath, but manifesting eternal life, was necessarily the salvation of man from death."

And to illustrate the signification of such teaching, we have the heroes who die on battle fields for liberty styled "redeemers," in the very sense in which the author esteems our Saviour who expired on the cross; in his view, not as a propitiation, but as an example. We do not believe Mr. Brooke ever celebrated without a secret reservation, the Holy Communion, when he repeats the words:

"Thou of thy tender mercy didst give thy only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death on the Cross for our redemption, who made there by his one oblation of himself once offered a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

Recently we have seen in the learned Articles on "Soteriology," in this Review how the doctrine of vicarious atonement is taught in all ages by the Fathers of the Catholic Church.

We venture to affirm, that it can be demonstrated that Mr. Brooke declares opinions in this volume which logically and inevitably tear away the very basis of our faith in the Mysteries of our Holy Religion, and would reduce Christianity to a mere system of naturalism, where the central object is our Saviour living and dying, as an example of virtue to mankind. Avowing the sentiments of the following extract, he certainly has no solid reason for believing in the doctrine of the Trinity, or the Incarnation, or the Resurrection, in any manner which can consistently keep him in the communion of the Catholic Church. Lesson, Collect, Epistle, Gospel, every time he reads or u

ervice, must, from lecturn and altar, start some reproving image to
or alarm his conscience. His subsequent admission that Christ "con-
ided" to the "weakness" of the Jews, and "did many mighty *works*,"
closely examined, in no degree relieves the charge of Rationalism which
ost unhesitatingly prefer against a subscribed and supported Clergyman
Church of England. We part painfully from the interesting and
nt sermons of a gifted, but misguided man, by quoting from a discourse
"The Religion of Signs:"

om the ancient days of the people of Israel, when Moses, knowing the character
nation, asked of God that he would vouchsafe to him a sensible sign to show as
of his mission until the time of Christ, we find among the Jews the craving for
and wonders. They desired material proof for spiritual things; they demanded
very revelation should be accredited by miracles. It was through the gate of
ses, and under the guidance of wonder, not through the gate of the spirit and
the guidance of faith, that they entered the temple of religion. Now this was
tely a childish position. The child is the scholar of the senses, but it is a dis-
to a man to be their slave. The child may believe that the moon is self-luminous;
rough the believing that error that he finds out its erroneousness—but it is ridicu-
or him who has examined the question, not to say: My senses are wrong. It is spirit-
ldishness which believes that a doctrine or a man's life is true because of a miracle.
iracle speaks for the most part to the senses, and the senses can tell us nothing of
iritual world. It is spiritual manhood which out of a heart educated by the
nce arising from the slow rejection of error, can say with spiritual truth, 'It is
must be so. *I have the witness of it within, and though a thousand miracles were
test the denial of it, I should cling to it unswervingly.*' He says of our Saviour:
greatest utterances, where all was great, were spoken in a spirit contrary to this
n of the senses. He threw men back upon the *witnesses of their own heart.* He
way with fierce and pregnant words all the jugglery and superstitious ceremonial
which men had overloaded the simple idea of God, and he called them back to
l life and feeling, to child-like trust in a Father ever near to them, to a simple
ure morality. But at the same time he presented to their effort a grand ideal,
though it seemed too high for human nature, has yet stirred and exalted men
ther ideal has done."

is what the Germans call "instinct," what Dr. Temple styled "con-
e," is by Mr. Brooke denominated a "witness," and something within
an must, through his own consciousness, decide on the truth of the
of God. We inquire—Does the writer believe the Mysteries of the
to which he stands pledged before earth and heaven? Does he look
own spirit for the proof of the Trinity? Does he find a witness within
truth of the Incarnation? Does he perceive in the soul a demonstra-
f the Resurrection of the body? Nay! he cannot find even in creation
e of these mysteries. He utterly errs in confounding the proofs of
ianity with the truths of Christianity. The proofs are sensible; the
are spiritual. The proofs are addressed to bodily organs—the truths ap-
spiritual faculties. The proofs are facts—the truths are principles.
les are indeed the only foundation for our belief in Mysteries, but
we receive the Mysteries we need not despise the Miracles, as the As-
ner does not discard those principles of the science which irresistibly
l the universe because he has demonstrated their truth so sensibly
gh his telescope.

We have dwelt long on this volume because we perceive in it peril to the Faith. We have been taught to admire the English government. We have been taught to venerate the English Church. We have been taught to eulogize the English nation. But if such rationalism poisoning the whole life of Faith has to be tolerated on account of the establishment: if the name of a Clergyman must give all the sanction of his position to increase the circulation of such error: if Socinians and Infidels are to exult over publications strengthening their views from such a source, and there is no other remedy, it would be far better that every revenue of the Anglican Church should be seized by the State, and appropriated to the people, than that preachers of falsehood should through Episcopal ordination be commissioned as angels of truth.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *By Arthur A. Haddan, D.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, Late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. Rivingtons, London, Oxford and Cambridge. Pott & Amery, New York*, 1869.

The doctrine of the Apostolic Succession has a vital connection with our view of the divine institution of the Church. We claim our Lord as our Founder. But if there were any interruption in the descent we would have to trace our organization not, as now, to Jesus Christ, but to some Calvin, or Fox, or Wesley. Therefore the authenticity and dignity of our commission as ambassadors of Heaven are involved in such inquiries as those so ably prosecuted by Mr. Haddan. That men impressed with lofty views of the importance of the succession, would use every effort to preserve each link in the chain winding through the ages, is antecedently probable, and when we add to the presumption an actual list of names sacredly guarded, we support our claim not only with strong but satisfying proof. Still the subject is one which needs to be frequently and carefully stated. Mr. Haddan has brought to his task sound judgment, balanced faculties, extensive learning, liberal feeling, and earnest conviction. His presentation of the argument in regard to Archbishop Parker's consecration is not only admirable, but unsurpassed. He absolutely demolishes the silly stories of the Romanists. We are sorry that the style of Mr. Haddan is labored, involved, and inelegant, and we can scarcely conceive how a man of such intellect and culture could ever have permitted himself to become so unattractive as a writer. Yet while his argument is not expressed with grace it is never deficient in interest. It is also gratifying to remark how cheerfully our author concedes that in the Scriptural period of the primitive Church the ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβυτέρος were used interchangeably, so that the three orders of the ministry existed as now in fact, but not in designation. Strong conviction is evinced by honest concession, and truth can never be confirmed by maintaining error. Mr. Haddan's statements in regard to religious organizations not having ministers within the Apostolic Succession, are wise and excellent. He guards the sacredness of the divine order without harshness towards lamented ignorance. But we will conclude our notice by showing in the words of our author his view of his subject.

"I. First then—to begin at the fountain-head—belief in an Apostolic Ministry implies a belief in the continued existence and continued need of supernatural gifts:—that Christianity is neither a philosophy only, nor a moral system only, nor a change of feeling, sentiment or will, self-caused, and nothing more, but beyond all these, and indeed as the cause and foundation of all of them, first a revelation of supernatural truths which claim, not opinion, but faith; and next a supernatural dealing with the souls of men, whereby they are transformed by God's invisible work and operation, yet through their own will and moral nature, into a new and restored moral being, and are by like spiritual gifts retained in that new being, or replaced in it—a belief in a supernatural relation of truth, and a supernatural gift of spiritual life—a belief in the *grace of God.*

II. But then, secondly, the doctrine in question implies a belief that these gifts of grace are entrusted to a corporate body, and continued in the world by God Himself, and that they are to be obtained ordinarily and primarily by the individual Christian as in union with Christ through His mystical body upon earth, or in other words that the Church of Christ to which Christians must be joined is not a voluntary religious club, or a department of the State for religious purposes,—but that it is a divinely constituted and visible body, the appointed witness of God's revelation, and the appointed channel of God's grace.

III. And then further, the same doctrine implies also a belief that in this Church there is a divinely constituted ministry: that the body corporate called the Church acts ordinarily through an order of men set apart by God's ordinance from their fellow Christians as ministers of the spiritual gifts entrusted to it: stewards of the mysteries of God, to give to each his portion in due season, *i. e.* an order of men who are not simply convenient ministers of material charities, or lecturers on Christian morals, or expounders of a theory of theology, or State officers to maintain a moral police, or again the mere mouthpieces to make united worship possible, or the self-elected officers of a voluntary religious club, or men with a special education qualifying them as a professional class of religious teachers, or who think themselves called to preach to others, not even simply men sent to proclaim certain truths, but beyond even the last of these men to whom God by His appointed instruments has entrusted certain authority and powers, a message of truth to be delivered, and gifts of grace to be dispensed; *ministers of the Word and Sacraments.*

IV. And this view of the ministerial office leads necessarily to a further step,—a belief in the *grace of* orders, *i. e.* in the necessity and in the spiritual effectiveness of a proper formal ordination.

V. And then we are further limited upon scriptural and historical grounds to a belief that the office of ministering the outward call and appointment, thus rendered necessary, belongs to a special class in the ministry, to whom alone the Apostles gave it, viz. Bishops—a belief in Episcopal ordination.

VI. Lastly, if the grace of orders be a grace at all, we are brought in the end to that which is specially intended by Apostolical Succession, viz. to a belief that the gift of orders so transmitted by the Bishop, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, must needs have descended in an unbroken line from those who first had it—viz. the Apostles."

"It means in few words without Bishops no Presbyters, without Bishops and Presbyters no legitimate certainty of Sacraments, without Sacraments no certain union with Christ, and without that union no Salvation. Yet with these necessary provisions at each step by the very nature of the moral laws, and attributes of Almighty God, *first, if those outward things may be had, and next with every allowance for ignorance, prejudice, and necessity,* and lastly and above all, as a system subservient and ministering both to a true faith, and a living religion, and hearty love of Christ in the soul."

We confess if these extracts do not express the meaning of the Scripture, and the concurrent views of the Greek, and Latin, and Anglican Fathers, and the signification of our own Prayer-Book, we are utterly unable to understand how plain words can ever make a plain subject comprehensible by plain men.

ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY. *Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D.* 325. *Edited by Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D., and James Donaldson, LL. D. Vols. XIII and XIV. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke.* 38 *George St.* New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

We have spoken again and again of this noble work, and pointed out its especial value to the Church. The perusal of the Ante-Nicene Fathers produces on the mind an unconscious but most powerful conviction of the truth of her claims. In them we perceive how entirely the Anglican Reformation restored to us the Apostolic Church, and are equally strengthened against sectism, and mediævalism. The simplicity of the earlier writers and even in some instances their credulity does not detract from their testimony in regard to facts where they had every opportunity to observe, and no possible motive to misrepresent. When we reach the time of St. Cyprian, his works have an attractive value for precisely an opposite reason. In his day the entire system of the Church was seen in its perfect practical development, and in himself we behold a remarkable impersonation of its spirit. He is indeed almost a typical Bishop. His natural genius, his legal training, his philosophical culture, his social position, his extensive learning, his brilliant imagination, his fascinating style, his noble charity, his entire devotion, his heroic courage invest his career with interest, and his character with majesty. While he was a man of battle he was also a man of peace; stern towards the sin he was tender towards the sinner. Finally, martyrdom attested his courage, and like a halo crowned his illustrious career. While his style was always rhetorical, and often ornate, his thoughts were uniformly solid and his sincerity apparent. We know few passages more eloquent than the conclusion of his "Exhortation to Martyrdom."

"The brave and steadfast mind, founded in religious meditation endures; and the spirit abides unmoved against all the terrors of the devil, and the threats of the world, when it is strengthened by the sure and solid faith of things to come. In persecution earth is shut up, but heaven is opened; antichrist is threatening, but Christ is protecting; death is brought in, but immortality follows; the world is taken away from him that is slain, but paradise is set forth to him restored; the life of time is extinguished, but the life of eternity is realized. What dignity it is, and what a security, to gladly go from hence, to depart gloriously in the midst of afflictions and tribulations; in a moment to close the eyes with which men and the world are looked upon, and at once to open them to look upon God and Christ!. In persecution, the warfare; in peace, the purity of conscience is crowned."

Besides the Essay on "Martyrdom" from which we have quoted, the thirteenth volume of the Library contains several other treatises and discourses of St. Cyprian, including what he wrote concerning the "Baptism of Heretics," and his description of the "Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas." Then

low the writings of Novatian, and Dionysius of Alexandria, and Minu-
s Felix. The fourteenth volume gives us the remains of Methodius;
exander, Bishop of Lycopolis; Peter, Bishop of Alexandria; Alexander,
hop of Alexandria; Clement, of Rome; Theognostus of Alexandria;
rius, of Alexandria; Malchion, a Presbyter of the Church of Antioch;
atolius, of Alexandria; Phileas, Bishop of Thmuis, and martyr; and
nphilius, Presbyter of the Church of Cæsarea, and martyr. We append
description of a Garden from the "Banquet of the Virgins," by Metho-
s, which certainly proves that Theology did not wholly extinguish fancy
the Ancient Fathers.

"The air was diffused in soft and regular currents, mingled with pure beams of light,
l a stream flowing as gently as oil through the very middle of the garden, threw up
most delicious drink; and the water flowing from it, transparent and pure, formed it-
into fountains, and these overflowing like rivers, watered all the garden with their
undant streams, and there were different kinds of trees there, full of fresh fruits, and
fruits that hung joyfully from their branches were of equal beauty! and there were
r-blooming meadows strewn with variegated and sweet scented flowers from which
s a gentle breeze laden with the richest odor. And the Agnus grew near, a lofty
e under which we reposed, from its being exceedingly wide-spreading and shady."

ETCHES OF CREATION: *A popular view of some of the Grand Conclusions of the Sciences in reference to the History of Matter and of Life. Together with a Statement of the Intimations of Science respecting the Primordial Condition and the ultimate Destiny of the Earth, and of the Solar System. By* ALEXANDER WINCHELL, LL. D., *Professor of Geology, Zoology and Botany in the University of Michigan, and Director of the State Geological Survey. With illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square.* 1870.

We have here a most graphic picture of creation from eternity to eternity.
obably no man has ever been so entirely acquainted with the councils of
aven as the author. He speaks with the assurance of inspiration, and in a
wing style evincing an imagination rather invigorated than subdued by the
rn inductions of Science. We can imagine the youth who crowd his lectures
dling into enthusiastic admiration as they catch from his lips intensifying
thets and brilliant images so entirely in harmony with their own peculiar
tes and ardent impulses. As we read these pictured pages we are com-
ted to know that God, indeed, "created the heavens and the earth," how-
r patronising the recognition. Then we see the universe a vast mass of
eous matter. The radiations of heat produce rotations. Rolling worlds are
nerated. Fragments fly off to form revolving satellites. The earth is a
be of fire. Then it becomes water. Each processs is described by which its
sent shape is assumed. The conflagration of our own continent is sketched
h especial minuteness. Those dim ages of gigantic vegetations and marvel-
s monsters pass before us as familiarly as the birds on our lawn, or the trees
our orchard. Subsequent periods of geological history are traced with the
me confident skill and unfailing ardor, until earth completes her decreed
iod by crashing into the sun. It is admitted as doubtful whether the
ent will receive his returning child to a bosom of snow or of flame. As the

probabilities here are balanced, perhaps, the Scripture theory of fire may be permitted. It is, however, determined by Scientific deduction with the certainty of inspired prophecy, that before the final catastrophe, the secrets of the world over the grave will be unfolded to those disciples, who, like our author, so carefully pursue the severe processes of investigation marked out by Bacon and Newton. Dr. Winchell says :—

"The unseen world is destined to become like a newly discovered continent. We shall visit it—we shall hold communion with it—we shall wonder how so many thousand years shall have passed without our being introduced to it. We shall learn of other modes of existence—intermediate, perhaps, between body and spirit—having the forms and limitations in space peculiar to matter with the penetrability and irresistibility of spirit."

Nor must we be astonished that in this age when the telegraph girdles the earth, and the telescope deciphers the moon, and the spectroscope analyzes the sun, Science, transcending prophecy, by her *careful* induction should be able to inform us what precisely will occur in the process of our planet's destruction, at least, in case the ruin should be in ice rather than in fire. With what admirable precision can Geology now speak! How sober its style! How modest its spirit! How marvellous its exactitude! Where ancient Scripture expresses its predictions in unsatisfying generalities, modern Science, surpassing inspiration, gives the most cheering details. We know nothing in the triumphs of Induction more astonishing than the discovery of Dr. Winchell contained in our concluding extract, and can scarcely wonder that the Bible is falling behind the progress of the age, and can only marvel that amid such a blaze of new revelations he should himself cling to the old faith.

"The end arrives, unless some sudden catastrophe sweep the race from being in a day, the time will come when *two* men will only survive of all the human race. *Two* men will look around upon the ruins of the workmanship of a mighty people. *Two* men will gaze upon the tombs of the human family. *Two* men will stand petrified at the sight of, perhaps, a hundred thousand corpses prostrated around them by the dire hardships which every moment threaten to carry them also away. These *two* men will gaze into each other's faces—wan, thin, hungry, despairing. Speech will have deserted them. Silent, gazing each into eternity—more dead than living—an overpowering emotion—an inspiring hope—and one of them drops by the feet of the sole survivor of God's intelligent race. Thrice honored, thrice exalted man! He stands there to testify for all mankind. In what words shall he say farewell? The last man has composed his body to *eternal* rest. This once fair earth is a cold and desolate corse. Nature's tears are ice—she weeps no more. The face of the sun is veiled. It is midnight in the highways of the planets. The spirits of heaven mourn at the funeral of nature."

After such inductive achievements we can scarcely doubt that Science, in the due processes of her noble development, will at last inform humanity whether the grief of angelic intelligences over the gloom of a frozen creation will be expressed in white, representing its snow, or in black, emblematizing its darkness. Possibly the last two persons over whom they will mourn, instead of two men, may be two women, or even two children.

THE ANDES AND THE AMAZON: *Or, Across the Continent of South America. By* JAMES ORTON, M. A., *Professor of Natural History in Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and Corresponding Member of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square.* 1870.

:n a book into whose taking title is crowded the "Andes," the "Amazon," l the breadth of a continent, we must, of course, expect much interesting in-mation and many exciting descriptions. We shall not be disappointed. The :son who desires useful knowledge in graphic language should purchase s volume. We will select a description. Our author says:

' The Napo starts off in furious haste, for the fall between Napo's village and Santa sa, a distance of eighty miles, is three hundred and fifty feet. The passage of the ·ds is dangerous to all but an Indian. As Wallace says of a spot on the Rio Negro, ı are bewildered by the conflicting motions of the water; whirling and boiling eddies at as if from some subaqueous explosion; down-currents are one side of the canoe, l an up-current on the other; now a cross stream at the bows, and a diagonal one at stern with a *foaming* Scylla on your right, and a whirling Charybdis on the left."

We venture a request for our own relief and that of others—that the Pro-sor, in a subsequent edition, or in his next lecture to his pupils, or before a eting of the Academy of Sciences inform the world whether by "*foaming* 'lla," he intends a fact or a figure.

T-THOUGHTS. *The Experiences and Observations of an American Ama-ur in Europe. By* JAMES JACKSON JARVES, *author of "Art-Hints," "Art-tudies," "The Art-Idea," Honorary member of the Academy of Fine Arts, Florence, Italy, etc., etc. New York: published by Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge, Riverside Press.* 1869.

'erhaps our view may be a dream, and yet we confidently believe that the ıion of America in Government, Science, Literature, Art, Religion is to ve from the past of our world its grandest development in the future. In 'outh our nation often needed the encouragement of even excessive laudation. r in its maturing manhood it is sufficiently vigorous to be benefited ound and even severe criticism. We think Mr. Jarves undervalues Ameri-Art, and yet his sprightly and discriminating strictures will prove rather essing than an injury. The vine putting forth its first buds may be de-yed by a rough knife, but when expanded in its healthful growth, and n with the promise of ripe clusters, faithful pruning gives increased strength. ı, indeed, difficult for a man who has explored the treasures of European galleries to avoid the appearance of a self-conscious superiority, and yet Jarves has a true sympathy with our rising country, and has earned by his ıstry, ability and observation some title to the magisterial. We can cheer-y commend his volume, except in its theological opinions, believing that as ras honestly prepared it should be honestly received. His conclusion is ıirable both in conception and expression.

In favor of the spread of fine art in America we have a fresh æsthetic constitution temperament; the increasing passion of decoration, ornaments and festivals; a a, native instinct for color and form; the patriotic desire to commemorate public ı and events; a vast wealth each year more liberally given to beneficent purposes by ıg benefactors; increasing means of culture; a juster appreciation of national de-s and deficiencies in Art; an intenser spiritual apprehension of life, arising from the ious religious agitations as an offset to the redundant realism founded on rapid, ma-al progress; and above all the growing recognition of humanity at large as the true ıct of effort to make the earth more pleasant for man's temporary abode while school-

ing for a higher existence. The passion of the Greek for beauty made his Art beautiful, just as the emotional fervor of the mediævalist made his spiritual. We are not called to repeat either Minervas, Venuses, Queens of Heaven, or any of the effete forms of effete mythologies, but to create anew according to more advanced notions of heroisms, celestial or mundane—each after its kind in Art, realism or the 'glory of the terrestrial,' as St. Paul defines the idealisms of earth, and 'the glory of the celestial,' those of Heaven. 'As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.' The artist should beware of confounding the spiritual in Art with the realistic. Both are legitimate phases. The American school will be born of our own material and spiritual life, our own faith in, and sacrifices for, humanity, and of those profound social, political and religious connections that make up a religion of the heart whose fruit shall be the divinely announced, 'Peace and Good-will' of Bethlehem."

OUR NEW VICAR. *By* REV. J. S. B. MONSELL, LL. D., *Rural Dean and Vicar, of Engham. Fourth edition. London: Bell & Daldy. New York: Pott & Amery.* 1870.

In our young and vigorous Republic the Church needs men who, with piety and courage, unite both tact and courage. Each Clergyman should seek to catch and personify our ecclesiastical genius, and make it a living, working, triumphing fact in his parish. From within and without he will experience opposition. Now we know no volume where he will find more practical suggestions than in this unpretending book of Dr. Monsell. He has developed that conception of the Church which will yet govern the world. We sincerely wish his beautiful and valuable chapter on "Sisterhoods" had been read before certain unpleasant events had occurred in our own metropolis. Let us hope there is not an American Clergyman who will not peruse his book, and not an American Parish which will not secure it for the benefit of both young and old,

THE CHURCH IDEA. *An Essay towards Unity. By* WILLIAM REED HUNTINGTON, *Rector of All Saints', Worcester. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.,* 713 *Broadway.* 1870.

This is a calm, thoughtful, scholarly and yet popular volume—well-intended, well-conceived and well-expressed. It presents Romanism as an exaggeration, Puritanism as a diminution, and Liberalism as a distortion of the Church Idea. The author's views in regard to the "American Problem," are exceedingly suggestive. We cannot agree with the opinion that the Apostles' Creed, whose origin is uncertain, should ever, in regard to Laity or Clergy, have any preference over the Nicene Creed, authenticated by an Œcumenical Council. Nor can we sanction the suggestions of Mr. Huntington in regard to our Liturgy. Any relaxation in the universality of its use will impair our connection with the past of the Catholic Church, and disturb that uniformity of worship we justly regard as our boast and glory. While we do not think that his "Church Idea" embraces the full conception of our Church spirit and our Church history, yet we believe that its author has performed a valuable service, and his work deserves to be purchased and to be pondered.

JOHN PLOUGHMAN'S TALK: OR PLAIN ADVICE FOR PLAIN PEOPLE. *By* C. H. SPURGEON. *New York: Sheldon & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.*

Mr. Spurgeon in his prayers, sermons and conversations is still Mr. Spurgeon. His peculiarities are, of course, more apparent when he speaks as a Ploughman

ı when he speaks as a Preacher. We have in this volume the man seen n removed from those few remaining conventionalisms which even yet re- t Mr. Spurgeon in the pulpit. His other works have always their coarse- relieved by many brilliant original thoughts and passages of truthful elo- ıce, bursting from a man whose genius we never question, even where we ɔt his taste, or his culture. In "John Ploughman" there is no such grate- variety. But there are numerous instances of shrewd observation, keen and telling expression. The book exhibits more talent than reverence, and ı truth than beauty.

IENT STATES AND EMPIRES, FOR COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS. *By John rd, LL.D. Author of the "Old Roman World," "Modern History," c. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.* 1869. *8vo. pp.* 645.

sides the usefulness of this work in Colleges and Schools, for which it was ned, and for which we think it is well adapted, we predict for it a welcome tion among a large number of educated and general readers. Every igent person needs a work just like this. The great names and the great of Ancient History are all the while recurring, and a volume like the one ı us, containing most of the salient points of that history, clearly stated, ıost as indispensable as a Dictionary. The volume is divided into three ı, as follows: Book I. The Ancient Oriental Nations. Book II. The an States. Book III. The Roman Empire. The work is necessarily ıary; its style is compact, clear and incisive, and, notwithstanding the ity of criticism to which it has been exposed, we think it usually reliable.

IBERS' ENCYCLOPÆDIA: *A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge for the ple, on the basis of the latest editions of the German Conversations- ricon. Illustrated by Wood Engravings and Maps. Vol. X. Philadel- a: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers,* 1869. . *pp.* 821.

.s now about ten years since the Messrs. Chambers issued the first volume ıir Encyclopædia, or Dictionary of Universal Knowledge for the People. first plan was to translate the celebrated German work, the *Conversa- Lexicon*, which was so popular, that it has passed through ten or more ıns. But they soon abandoned that idea. The work was too German, ıe-sided; too much given to German mysticism and abstractions. It was ractical, and neglected too much the latest discoveries of Modern Science ;he developments in the Useful Arts. The Messrs. Chambers were just ıen to utilize the German work, and to do this in the most thorough and ssful manner. Taking the *Conversations-Lexicon* as the basis, they have 1 an entirely new work, which, after some examination and comparison ı not hesitate to pronounce the best popular Encyclopædia in the English age. More than one hundred different writers have been employed upon t extends to eight thousand three hundred and twenty pages, and con- upwards of twenty-seven thousand distinct articles. It is particularly n Natural History, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Philosophy, Ancient Modern and Oriental; the Fine Arts, Biography, Geography, Religious ſs, etc., etc. Besides the profuse Illustrations, which are scattered freely

throughout the work, the publishers have also issued, as a supplementary volume, an Atlas, containing a series of *thirty-nine* colored Maps, and also a Map of the Annual Revolution of the Earth round the Sun. There is so much downright infidelity, communism and sciolism in some of our modern Cyclopædias, that we are glad to welcome a work in this respect so unexceptionable, and in every regard so satisfactory.

THE ROMANCE OF SPANISH HISTORY. *By* JOHN S. C. ABBOTT, *author of "The French Revolution," etc., etc. With illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square.* 1869.

Spain, in the minds of all who love antiquity, has a rare lineage and heraldry. The land itself, surrounded by seas which from the beginning were the highways of the most ancient commerce, and traversed by mountain ranges which give variety of climate and landscape, has never lacked a certain singular and ever changing life and beauty. But it is the story of human weal and woe which has given Spain such a tragic interest and pathos. In its peninsula, as a stage, some of the most shadowy and solemn events as well as the most illustrious and magnificent have proceeded to fill one with awe or pleasure. It is the land of the Carthagenian, the Goth, the Moor, of Ferdinand and Isabella, of Columbus, Cortez and Pizarro, of the Cid and Cervantes and of Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus. Above all it has been the land of wars. From the Siege of Saguntum, where a whole city perished, the women and children seated on a vast funeral pyre and consumed to ashes, while the men sold dearly their lives on the edge of the Carthagenian sword, to the Siege of Saragossa, there is no realm more famed for the bloody fury and sublimity of war than Spain. Such is the material which Mr. Abbott found at hand when he made "The Romance of Spanish History" into a book, evidently written for young persons and grown folks who wish to be instructed without the labor of thinking, and neither lacking in romance nor possessing the maximum of history. Occasionally approaching eloquence, sometimes pathos, always interesting with its very intelligible manner and matter, and level to the common moods of not uncommon minds, it never reaches the height of artistic work, but contrariwise, shows how thin the currents of our popular writings. For Mr. Abbott is popular, and as a historian, unreliable in a very marked degree. Declining to make himself the master, as every true artist and teacher does, he becomes the literary serf and workman of that dominant public, to whose taste he skillfully caters. It is a path which gives a man more money than fame. We do not intend in this notice to judge Mr. Abbott's handicraft by the high standard of true art; but when we turn from reading Irving's delightful pages or Prescott's judicious and finely balanced historic passages and judgments, touching this same venerable and romantic Spain, or lay down Napier's military history of the Peninsular War, and peruse Mr. Abbott's romance, we feel as though we had left a gallery of antique and noble statues to enter the shop of some very common potter. The critic of to-day has often a singular task in reviewing books, valuable to the public, as *it* counts values, and yet, as judged in the forum of literary merit, of inferior worth.

' IN THE JUNGLE. *Narrated for young people, by Paul Du Chaillu, thor of Discoveries in Africa, &c. With numerous engravings. New York, rper & Brothers, Franklin Square,* 1870.

may be perhaps questioned how far books filled with adventures in g gorillas have a healthy influence on the young. Certainly no novels ıore eagerly read, and these pages of Du Chaillu can scarcely be excelled : in vivacious description, or daring exploits.

TESTAMENT SHADOWS OF NEW TESTAMENT TRUTHS. *By* LYMAN ABBOTT, *thor of Jesus of Nazareth, &c. With designs by Doré, Delaroche, Durs, and Parsons. New York, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, Franklin sare,* 1870.

e aim of this volume is stated in the Preface.

ıe Old Testament is more full of parables than the New. Its history is prophetic. ɔries are parables in real life. The Chronicles of Israel are full of God's foreings of the redemption of the world. From the fall in Eden to the restoration Jews under Ezra, they are, all along the way, finger posts that point to the Cross ist. Their inscriptions are sometimes so plain that the wayfaring man, though a ɔed not err therein. They are sometimes so obscured that the heedless traveler hem not. These finger posts I seek to decipher; these parables to interpret. ght that shines from the Old Testament is that of the star of Bethlehem, which ıts the reader to the manger of his incarnate Lord. That star I seek to follow."

th this plan the book contains fourteen papers, chapters or lectures, ver they may be called, on as many dramatic events in Old Testament y, beginning with the Cities of the plain, and ending with the Queen's ı, which turns out to be Mr. Abbott's annotated story of Queen Esther. ook is elegantly prepared, and the Illustrations are well selected, yet the seems to us to be of that superficial and diluted learning, which suits the public palate in this age.

SPORTS OF THE WORLD: A BOOK OF NATURAL HISTORY AND ADVENE. *By James Greenwood & Co. With one hundred and forty-seven ıstrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square,* 0.

ery page of this book we confess to have read with a child's eagerness and ıction, and we never expect to be so old as not to enjoy a work like this a profound delight. In the midst of a masculine household of young re have managed to secure the privilege, often challenged or interrupted, usal in our study, in spite of a crowd of eager aspirants for its favor and . Men have hunted from the time of Nimrod, and before, but we doubt ıer Nimrod ever pursued so many or so redoubtable beasts as any reader is book easily may, if he will only follow our charming author to his diversified and thrilling chase in the green woods. This book is a comum of the hunt, on that side of it which relates to the ways and homes ɔ brutes followed, and the luck which famous hunters have met in their ınd reckless pastime. Titbits of hunting lore out of Gordon Cummings, ıen like him, have a very savory taste to the minds of those who favor a neck dash after buffalo or fox, or think they would like to crawl on

hands and knees, or under the broad and brown striped leaves of the India jungle, where the tawny tiger skulks away to his lair, with his mouth yet red from the goat he lately confiscated by the roadside, or from a far ghastlier dinner which he has made on some poor Asiatic villager or traveler. And that there is in most men and boys with blood in their veins a taste for the hunt, few will deny. There is something which moves us to an eager interest, when in a comfortable parlor we read of our modern Nimrods standing before a lion or an elephant, with only a slender iron tube between the man and death. And then to see that man alone with steady nerve hold in his hand the weight and majesty of modern civilization as it embodies itself in the rifle, and conquer down at his feet giant beasts, his masters in all forces except that wit which makes him a Nineteenth century hunter, is what fills us with a certain pride in the race to which we belong. God hath put in subjection all things under man's feet, and heavy rifles keep them there. Men like Gerard, "the Lion Killer," or Cummings, have killed more and larger game in one week than all the Nimrods and Hercules of the ancient world in a twelve-month.

This book especially where it undertakes to teach natural history is not exhaustive. But it is fresh, vivacious, exciting, with the best of the late hunting feats gathered into its story, and is capital for brave wonder-loving boys. We do not remember to have seen better wood cuts in an American volume of this order. Its pages are a realm of bears, tigers, lions, hippopotami, wolves, alligators, elephants, walrusses, and a host of wild animals. The article on the Chamois of the Alps has struck us as among the most fresh and novel.

THE HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION. *By Amos Dean, LL.D. In seven volumes. Vol. VII. Albany, N. Y., Joel Munsell,* 1869.

This volume treats of European Art in eight divisions—Architecture, Sculpture, Painting, Music, Poetry, Eloquence, The Drama, The Military Art. Of course in so wide a field one can only glean into a volume some of the wheat, and leave the rest on the ground. In preceding numbers of this Review, we have passed judgment on the general traits of this in some respects remarkable book. It is remarkable for its learning, its patient research, its judicial temper, its kindly discussion of vexed questions, and above all for not containing one sentiment (so far as we have remarked) which can offend the religion of a Christian. We suspect that its publication is meant to rear a monument among men to the memory of a good and learned man; and such it certainly is. Below men like Buckle and Hallam in intellectual altitude and singularly wanting in subtle, philosophical analysis touching the heart of things, yet few Americans have done more patient and stalwart literary work than Professor Dean. The value of this volume consists in its furnishing a cue by which the young scholar may investigate the modern artistic developments of Western Christendom. In the division of Architecture, the Professor shows a surprising knowlenge of the details of his subject, and touches briefly on most of the vital points in its discussion. Other topics like Poetry and Eloquence are treated in a mere sketchy and superficial manner. The book is not exhaustive but encyclopedic, broad not deep. It is certainly a rich storehouse of the history of the world.

ISTORY OF JOSEPH BONAPARTE, KING OF NAPLES AND OF ITALY. *By John S. C. Abbott, Author of the History of Napoleon Bonaparte, &c., &c.* New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square, 1870.

This is another book of Mr. Abbott's, and a so called-history of one of the napartes. He has already acquired a not altogether enviable reputation the biographer of Bonaparte the great. With that achievement or any ıer of his in the historical line we trouble ourselves no farther than to de-re that all such writers have the most meagre claims to the great name of torians. In the society where this criticism, if it be just, places him, . Abbott has a multitude of confederates against historical accuracy and tice. For to any man moderately versed in facts, who still entertains the y old and somewhat antiquated idea that there is nothing better in men books than simple honest truth, some modern history writers are very picious and delusive and partisan novelists whose invention is their most ıspicuous virtue.

Mr. Abbott is a busy, buzzing, bright writer among a crowd that often ırtop him by their intellect and learning: and his literary virtues are east marketable in an age which delights in fiction. Without doubt eph Bonaparte, the hero of the present writing, was an amiable, philo-hic, modest, meek man, who was lifted by the strong military arm of his ıt brother into thrones which he never filled, and over people he never trolled. King of Naples and then of Spain, he neither crushed the aroni who stabbed and blew up houses where women and children slept, governed the treacherous and superstitious Spaniards, who greeted to-day with vivas in all their cities, and to-morrow left him friendless in heir land. Lacking all talent for kingcraft he floated where the tide ı him, and in latter life enjoyed that retirement for which he was alone d.

HISTORY OF AMERICAN SOCIALISMS. By JOHN HUMPHREY NOYES. J. B. LIPPINCOTT. Phila. Royal 8vo., pp. 678.

ıere has scarcely been a time, when men have not been ready to forsake those ıtutions which God established for our happiness and guidance, and to at-ɔt something more flatttering to pride and self-love. They have but to ques-the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and to renounce the binding obli-ɔns of the Christian Religion: and then the way is open for any human ıme. But the attempt has invariably been followed by early failure. The aph is soon written, which tells a story more or less brief of folly, and the r inefficacy of those institutions which are intended to supersede Divine or-ınces.

ır opinions are fully demonstrated in "The History of American Socialisms." ı work gives an account of forty or fifty organizations. But the experiments ɔ been made mostly under the leadership of Robert Owen and his followers, of Fourier, imitated by such men as Charles Brisbane, Horace Greeley, and rles A. Dana. Robert Owen was a Scotch manufacturer, and came to this ıtry in 1824 to test his principles of Socialism. He openly acknowledged his lelity; and, although he reached our Republic with the reputation of a Re-ıer, it is perhaps no matter for surprise that in three years his enterprise ıld be pronounced to be *in articulo mortis.*

The Fourier epoch may be marked by the community at Brook Farm, in West Roxbury, Mass. This association originated in 1841. It was our pleasure to make a visit in 1846. While there were neatness, and good order, and apparent comfort and happiness, we could not fail to notice an aimless purpose, and that the bulwarks of the family were leveled; and it did not surprise us, that in the next year Fourierism became a forlorn hope in this country, and that an inquest was soon called for all its communities. So will it ever be with those who "hew out for themselves broken cisterns."

We commend this Book to those who are interested in the post-mortem examinations of Socialism. It will serve as a guide in all future experiments. It will show how enthusiasts have erred, and how the sanguine have been disappointed. It will illustrate the dear-bought experience of many social adventurers. It will give an idea of the labor of mind and body expended to realize an Utopia by turning the back on the real Gardens of Paradise.

This volume is neatly printed on tinted paper, by that very enterprising publisher, J. B. Lippincott, of Philadelphia, who has also a branch for the sale of his publications in Broome street of this city.

AMERICAN POLITICAL ECONOMY: Including Strictures on the Management of the Currency and the Finances since 1861, &c. By FRANCIS BEVEN. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co. 1870.

Professor Beven is known to Harvard students for perhaps the last twenty years as one of the hardest and clearest-headed thinkers in that ancient University. In this Book he has discussed with learning and acumen those economical laws of natural wealth which control the visible and social activities of a nation. His work is full of interest to the Statesman, and the Clergyman will find in its pages much food for those religious meditations with which he instructs his people. We commend it as a unique and serviceable hand-book on the matters discussed.

A GERMAN COURSE: Adapted to use in Colleges, High Schools and Academies. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages and Æsthetics in Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. New York: HARPER & BROTHERS, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

This manual, well printed, thorough and progressive, is another proof of the advance of American Scholarship in presenting the mysteries of a very rich and intricate language to the American mind which to-day confronts the ancient German civilization on American soil. It seems admirably adapted to its work.

CREATION A RECENT WORK OF GOD. By the Rector of St. Mary's Church, New York. New York: POTT & AMERY. Cooper Union. 1870.

Geology and Revelation do not and cannot contradict each other, since the Works of God cannot be contrary to His Word. So-called Geology and human interpretations of Holy Writ are in these days often at bitter war. Christian men like Hugh Miller have tried to adjust Science and Scripture, and have, in our judgment, as yet made no great gains for either. The time is not yet, and the man has not come who can say of this earth, "I know it," or of Genesis, "I comprehend it" This Book, written with much earnestness and a laudable intention, will hardly succeed in removing the ancient altercation of savans and theologians, and we fear we must wait still longer for the coming of peace.

ı Spain and a Visit to Portugal. By Hans Christian Andersen. Hurd & Houghton, Astor Place, N. Y., 1870.

Hans Andersen is too well known among young and old to need much comıent. His exquisite stories, either of fairy land or every-day life, are the deight of every heart.

The present book of travel is most gracefully and charmingly written, and rhen we turn the last leaf, we feel as if a tear would almost rise at parting with ur genial, kind-hearted traveling companion.

Of all the old historic lands, Spain possesses the most thorough romance. 'rovence with her troubadors—the wandering minstrels of "Old Englande"—the 'onderful dwellers of the Hartz mountains, are but shadows to the deeds of the id, and the pranks of Don Quixote.

We are apt in the present desolation of Spain to forget its past glory. Our :aveler finds somewhat of interest in every spot he visits. He gives one most ttractive pictures and amusing scenes among people that are represented to us ıe very epitomes of squalor and filth. Seville of all Spanish cities seems to have ıe most charm. Its picture gallery, its Murillos, its luscious fruits and darkyed beauties, make it interesting even as compared with any city in sunny taly.

We tread the Alhambra with our friend, and think we see those old Moorish nights and dreaming Sultanas in its marble halls; would fain rest ourselves by ıose rippling fountains, soothed by the intoxicating perfumes of Oriental flowrs, and awake to find ourselves among the ashes of past days. Washington Iring finds only *ruins*, and can only give his book interest by recalling *old* scenes. Ians Andersen makes Spain most interesting even at the present time. Spite f its poverty and fleas, the travel is comfortable, the food good, the people enɔyable; and one feels as if he would willingly forego the worn-out tour of the ontinent for a sojourn in this fascinating peninsula.

mmortality. Four Sermons Preached before the University of Cambridge. Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1868. By J. J. Stewart Perowne, B. D., &c. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 770 Broadway. 1870.

Four weighty, matured, and thorough prelections on one of the most solemn hemes that from age to age challenge the meditation of the thoughtful. Elsehere the matter has been more widely investigated, but here there is food and omfort for the religious mind strengthened by these sermons as to its Faith in mmortality.

'he Bazar Book of Decorum. The Care of the Person, Manners, Etiquette and Ceremonials. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

It would be difficult to say exactly what American manners at present are, and ɔod instruction therein is much needed. We therefore hail with pleasure any ew attempt to improve the fashions of our social intercourse, since good maners and good morals are more closely allied than many imagine. This Book has way of its own, and with a good modicum of learning, philosophy and common ense, gives much advice which may be profitably followed. Nobody can be worse ı manner for reading it. It is in parts amusing.

HAYDN AND OTHER POEMS. By the author of "Life Below." New York. Published by HURD & HOUGHTON. Cambridge. Riverside Press. 1870.

Poems are every author's pet children; and as it is the last insult to a mother to depreciate her offspring, so it sometimes seems to a tender-hearted critic cruelty to condemn a man's verses. Besides, verses are written for diverse objects—for fame, for friends, for money. We have tried to solve the problem, but are forced to say we cannot understand why these were ever printed.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE DEATH OF WOLSEY TO THE DEFEAT OF THE SPANISH ARMADA. *By James Anthony Froude, M. A. Reign of Elizabeth.*

To radically change the fixed historic opinions of a race touching very vital questions of its own history, is a rare and difficult achievement for any man. Yet James Anthony Froude has done this with regard to the age and chief functionaries of the English Reformation, and has rewritten the story of the spiritual struggles of a great nationality, not only with spirit and elegance, but above all, with a pen that probes close to the heart of the matter. To say that he has not always touched the heart itself, and especially in spiritual things, is merely to remind our readers that Froude is mortal. For while we confess that he has sometimes proved his point against us as unwilling Churchmen when he discloses the low and sordid ways of Church dignitaries and peels the crown a little too often on non-Conforming or at least non Churchly heads, the point where he shows his cardinal weakness, is his inability to grasp the idea of an outward historical Church pervaded inwardly by supernatural graces beyond our measurement which remain through all time unwasting fountains of power, yet outwardly colored and soiled by mortal taint and imperfection. Until Froude's time no history of our Reformation, rightly so called, had ever been written. For Hallam's stately disquisition on Constitutional Law, though judicial beyond any other, and cold and pure as an iceberg, shows a singular inability to grasp the inner secrets of our great ecclesiastical movement, while Hume, et id omne genus, are fancy-portrait and landscape painters, who are never vexed or moved by facts from their wishes. Froude on the contrary is a master builder who constructs the temple of these times out of the moss-grown or soil-covered stones scattered and cast down by time from the building, as it once was. Wherever he cannot recover a keystone or an arch, led away from his search, he has the wit to shape others very like the old. It is only where he comes to decipher the subtle and esoteric meanings of the temple, like those of time and space which explorers tell us are written in the Great Pyramids of Egypt, that he shows signs of narrowness and weakness. His work is a noble monument of real industry and historic lore, and is a new and rich possession for the English speaking race.

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—OCTOBER, 1870.—No. 3.

ART. I.—THE MODERN NOVEL.

Yourself in His Place. BY CHARLES READE. *New York. Harper & Brothers.* 1870.

and Wife. BY WILKIE COLLINS. *New York. Harper & Brothers,* 1870.

hair. BY THE RIGHT HON. B. DISRAELI. *New York. D. Appleton & Co.* 1870.

CULTURE produces effects which appear singularly opposite. It kes the mind at once more sensible to the charms of style, and re independent of its attractions. A mastery of the orations of mosthenes constrains us to more admire his argument than his quence. Thus a true Philosophy leads us to value expression, to place it greatly below thought in the scale of our estimation. th the multitude it is exceedingly different. Ultimately indeed must always address the common sense of mankind, and yet n is our appeal unless clothed with some special attractions. asoning on the most exciting and important topics is repulsive the masses unless it comes to them in some pleasing form. Nor his constitution of the human mind to be disregarded. While rakes the sneer of the visionary Philosopher, it is turned to ad-

vantage by those who know that to be successful we must be practical. And certainly a vain, and conceited, and unsympathizing scholarship should not in its contempt for mankind pretentiously elevate itself above the wisdom of the Deity who has prepared the entire system of Holy Scripture with a constant reference to that mental constitution we have indicated. In the third verse of the Pentateuch we have recorded not a cold description in scientific terminology, but an utterance of the Creator in the very words which commanded light from darkness. Then how large a portion shapes itself in lively dialogue where patriarchs, prophets, angels, the Almighty are the speakers! Thus when Revelation communicates its account of the formation of worlds, and the commencement of our religion, it studiously avoids the technicality, and the system of science. All the historical portions of the Scriptures, both in the Old Testament and in the New, make their narratives fresh and agreeable by the perpetually recurring dialogue, while the prophetical writings glow with poetic images, and the Psalms united the attractions of metre, and rhythm, and music. Even where the fundamental truths of Theology are developed, the very appearance of the formal and scholastic treatise is avoided. Paul unfolded his matchless arguments in the sprightly epistle, not in the dry essay, or the systematic text-book, and always concluded by descending from the head to the heart in the earnest exhortation, or the affectionate salutation. In every portion of the Scripture too are representations which exceed in their vigorous action the tragedies of Æschylus or Shakspeare. The whole life of our Saviour from the manger to the cross, and from His grave to His glory takes the shape of a stupendous Drama whose stage is the earth, and whose scene is the Universe, while the last Book of the Bible is a vast Panorama whose images are drawn from every part of Creation and Redemption, Time, and Eternity. And it is this very form in which the Deity has clothed His divine communications that makes the sacred volume the property of humanity, and places it in the home of the laborer as well as the study of the Philosopher.

It is only by keeping in our view this constitution of the mind regarded thus by its Maker that we can properly interpret ancient Art and Literature. The carved figures, and gigantic sculptures of Nineveh, and Babylon, and Egypt were the books of the people.

Homer became the idol of the Greek because he wrote in a style fascinating to the Greek. The Athenian was drawn to the Agora both by the beauty of the image and by the grace of the orator; and the Theatre was not only his resort for diversion but for instruction. Attic Philosophy did not scorn the charms of grove or portico. The Grecian games were vast institutions where the circling discus and the whirling chariot prepared for the glowing Poem, and the elegant narrative. Of the Literature of Rome little remains that has not derived immortality from the mere attractiveness of style. Mediævalism produced more than the ponderous scholastic time. Its rude Dramas and matchless Cathedrals alike uttered a language understood by the people. Especially in England, from the earliest periods, did Poetry and Art appeal to the popular heart. From Shakspeare to the present hour the Theatre in Britain and America has been one of the most powerful agencies ever employed to mould the national mind. But for nearly two centuries a new form of instructing humanity has been gradually increasing its influence and significance. Its precursors were, perhaps, the Utopia of More and the Arcadia of Sidney. These were, however, more adapted to the scholar than the people. The simple narrative of Defoe was the first tale producing that universal interest which has since, in repeated instances, been excited by the Modern Novel. Then Richardson, Fielding, Smollet, Sterne, Goldsmith, by all the attractions of style, and character, and incident, in a series of most brilliant creations, showed that a new art had been born into the world. Sir Walter Scott by the marvelous fertility of his genius at last gave the crowning evidence that human nature was stronger than the protests of Divines, or the contempt of Philosophers. To this fact Abbottsford stands an eternal monument of proof. Now not only school-girls and mechanics, but Statesmen and Theologians alike devour the novel.

Such a triumph of Fiction against such opposition from Press and Pulpit must find its explanation in the nature of man. Our age is compelled to accept the fact. Every Sunday-school Library gives evidence that Christianity itself has abandoned many of its old protests, and resorted for the attraction of its youth to tales not always the most refined, or elevated. Nay, not only the Novel, but even the Drama has defenders among men who are not to be charged with either a want of prudence or of piety. Why? Sim-

ply because they come to humanity with an appeal to those very elements implanted by the Creator, and consulted in every dialogue, and narrative, and parable, and allegory, and epistle, and poem, and representation of the Divine Scriptures themselves, and chosen by the wisdom of the Deity to make the Bible the Book of the people. Both the Novel and Drama may be perverted to error and immorality by Satan and his emissaries, as the Divine Word is itself abused, but the principles to which they owe their success are the very principles to which the Sacred Oracles owe their diffusion. It is therefore the policy and the duty of Christianity to seize, to purify, to elevate agencies so vast and so powerful, and employ them in the cause of truth, and for the spread of salvation.

And we may notice in the works whose names have been mentioned at the head of this Article, a purpose of fiction which is fast becoming the characteristic of this age, and which invests it with a new and startling interest. It reminds us in its development of the railroad and the telegraph. When Hero more than two thousand years ago whirled around his tubes by the reactionary power of steam, he never dreamed that in those childish rotations were revolving the future of our world. Nay, how little did even Stephenson imagine when the rocket moved with hissing boiler and sliding piston before the vast excited, astonished, cheering multitude, that in the simple elements of fire and water, so unappreciated, because so universal, slumbered a force which in his very application of it was to change the whole face of society, and affect the entire development of history and influence all the destinies of our race! Morse could not have conceived when he began to experiment merely with common acids, and common metals known even to common laborers, that with such elements he was to invent an instrument which should bridge oceans and cross continents, and by an electric spark make the nations over the earth almost a single community. Now the steam vessel, the railroad and the telegraph are pushing their way into the very heart of even Africa, Asia, and Australia, and placing the most secluded mountain hamlets in instant communication with the great centres of thought and commerce. And when Defoe wrote his simple tale to amuse children and repair his wasted fortunes, he could not have dreamed that in less than two centuries statesmen and philosophers would be employing fiction as the only pos-

ible means of largely reaching and moulding the multitude. Had ie imagined that Divines would be found one day preaching sermons, and the next inditing novels, he would have probably coveted exile in the island home of his solitary hero. Yet no man can interpret modern society without recognizing fiction as a fact.

We have noticed a change in the purpose of the novel. For more than a century its aim was almost wholly to please. Sir Walter Scott seems never to have any loftier purpose than the mere charm of his narrative. Dickens and Thackeray unquestionably purposed distinct ends in the correction of social evils, yet these were invariably if not intentionally a secondary consideration. In the interest of the story you usually lost sight of the object of the story. Indeed a novel for a purpose was branded as a species of hybrid monstrosity, which in departing from the genius of the tale, by seeking too much, sacrified everything. Many critics began to regard it as an axiom, that fiction teaching philosophy was neither philosophy nor fiction, or had necessarily all the dryness of philosophy without any of the interest of fiction. This theory has been disproved. "Put Yourself in his Place" proposes an assault on a vast social abuse. It is not refined in style. It is not elevated in its conception. It is not skillful in its delineation of character. It is not characterized by anything genial in humor, or sparkling in wit. It has no special beauty of description. It never rises in its morality above the principles of a heathen, and only aims to remove the wrong it assails by an appeal to interest and to passion. You arise from its perusal almost with a sense of relief, and without any sense of elevation. But your interest has been excited; you have been whirled away by a certain intensity of thought and boldness of invention which create a spell you cannot resist. Hence the multitude in car and steamboat and hotel, in town and city and country, in farm-house and study and drawing-room—mechanics, tradesmen, misses, collegians, scholars, lawyers, doctors, statesmen, divines everywhere read the volume. The interest is universal, and the profit is enormous. Yet in every part of the work is kept steadily in view a distinct end to be achieved. As you trace the history of a manly genius pursued by coarse workmen intent on his life—as you see him tempted by threatening letters, waylaid by assassins,

exposed to midnight explosions—as you follow him crossed in love, banished his country, and almost compelled to murder, every sympathy of your nature is aroused on the side of merit and courage, and you have an impression of the hatred, the revenge, the tyranny of trade-unions, which dry statistics and unadorned narration could never produce. An agency so lucrative and so powerful cannot be disregarded by the Christian philosopher.

The story of Mr. Collins is in aim similar to that of Mr. Reade, although more refined in treatment. His plot is most intricate, and interesting, and exciting; his style has never any special merit, and his characters evince no special skill. You miss the manly elevation of Scott, the genial sympathies of Dickens, and the critical satire of Thackeray. But you are riveted to the book by the skill and fertility of the invention. Nothing could be more improbable, and nothing could be more readable. Here too on every page is a pervading purpose. Rather we should trace three distinct aims. These are to caricature the British aristocracy, to ridicule British muscularism, and expose the absurdities of the laws of British marriage. The writer unquestionably produces an impression which stamps the Modern Novel with a new power as a revolutionary instrument of modern progress.

But it is a chief object of our Article to discuss more particularly a work which emanates from a higher source, moves on a higher plane, and contemplates a higher end. When we pass from Charles Reade or Wilkie Collins to Mr. D'Israeli we enter another atmosphere. Our transition is from the sphere of the sensational novelist to the world of the cultivated, and comprehensive statesman. We place ourselves within the spell not only of the man of genius but of the man of refined tastes and associations. The author of Lothair might indeed be chargeable with snobbery if his gift as a writer, his brilliance as an orator, and his ability in the cabinet, did not elevate him above so mean an aspersion. He can confer more on the English aristocracy than the English aristocracy can confer on him. The day may yet come when they will beg his guidance and assistance in defence of their order, and of the throne. But to properly estimate "Lothair" we must consider the motive which prompted its production. Its whole interest centres in its intention. Viewed simply as a novel it resembles an orderly garden remarkable for its stately trees, its superb walks,

and brilliant bloom, but where we are oppressed with the extravagance of the labor, and expense bestowed on its culture; or it is like a magnificent palace on which the skill of art has conferred a beauty, and splendor dazzlingly wearisome; or it reminds you of a decorated stage hung with gorgeous paintings where the puppets are in bright colors and flashing jewels, and in every motion exactly obedient to the will of the master. In this point of view it is a sparkling unreality over which the oriental element of Mr. D'Israeli's genius has cast a spell reminding us of those Arabian tales where gold, and diamonds and gardens, and palaces, and marvels are constantly appearing at the touch of an enchanter. Considered merely in the light of a story the style of "Lothair" appears insufferably stiff, and insufferably brilliant, the characters are either vapid, or unnatural, the plot is wholy devoid of interest, and it is only redeemed by flashes of wit, and satire, and the tokens of a genius which does not choose to employ all its resources. And greatly will we mistake if we construe the work as intended to bring ridicule, and contempt on the English nobility as a class. This was plainly the aim of Mr. Wilkie Collins in his "Man and Wife." He represents the Aristocracy as owls in a decayed summer house overrun with creepers, and flying in stupid dismay from the light poured into their darkness by modern improvement. They are typified by Geoffrey Delemayne, a mere muscular brute, incapable of any ambition above the silly applause of titled imbeciles, excited by success in the boat-race, or the foot race,—who sacrifices his friend, violates his most solemn promise, and at last seeks to murder the woman he has betrayed. But Mr. D'Israeli knew better than to indulge in such indiscriminate assault. He had come into close contact with the Earl of Derby, the talented translator of Homer, the unsurpassed debater and leader, and one of the most sturdy specimens of the old English manhood. He knew that in the House of Lords are orators and statesmen whose sagacity and eloquence are not exceeded in the House of Commons. He had seen in the homes of the aristocracy of his country too many proofs of sense, and refinement, and worth and piety to commit so vulgar an error, as that which characterizes novelists whose business is to excite prejudice that they may reap profit. To suppose that the late Premier of Great Britain would blast his own future as a politician, and incur the hatred of the party in which he has won his

triumphs, is absurd. At the same time there is one class of the English nobility as dissolute, as coarse, as contemptible as Mr. Collins could desire, and another class as vapid, and stupid, and pitiable as Mr. Reade could depict. Now Mr. D'Israeli wrote to influence this latter class. He can only be interpreted by constantly having in view this special purpose. Separated from its design "Lothair" is as stiffly artificial, as painfully unreal, as tediously brilliant as it has been frequently described. To understand the subject fully it is necessary to survey the present social, and political, and religious state of continental Europe in general, and of our maternal England in particular.

Old Rome swayed the world for centuries under her Emperors by her soldiers, and new Rome has sought during centuries to sway the world under Popes by her priests. The purple and scarlet of the two dominations have a prophetic resemblance. The declaration of Infallibility which Pius by the aid of his Jesuits has extorted from his council is the logical consummation of a consistent scheme which has been maturing for ages, and at last reached its result after hoary processes of intrigue, and simony, and battle, which have repeatedly deluged Europe with blood and filled it with horror. Opposition to this usurpation has been long detaching itself from the system, and concentrating itself on a person. It now combines all its forces against the Pope. Every revolutionary element on the continent is mingling in the struggle. In one point of view it is a question of Religion, in another of Liberty, and in another of Race. In the first it is a contest of Protestantism against Romanism, in the second a conflict of the people against tyranny, in the third a war of the Saxon against the Latin. It was the German, and the Englishman who stood against the Pope at the Reformation, and it is their descendants now who will yet marshal in both Europe and America in one final and universal battle. Unquestionable Atheists, Infidels, Jews, and even Turks may stand together with Protestant Christianity against this Roman usurpation which is seeking to enslave the world. The tie is not a common opinion, but a common interest and a common peril. The ideal Theodora, a child of genius and of the people, has been chosen by Mr. D'Israeli as the type of this grand united opposition. While British Premier, it became a duty of his position to study this movement practically, in all its phases, and ramifications, and he is doubtless a master of his subject. "Lothair," if it had no other

merit whatever, would be valuable simply for its delineations of the organized powers we have described, which extend themselves like a vast net-work over Europe and America.

But it is more especially in England we discover the clew to a novel which has been so universal in study, and so universal a puzzle. The Anglican church while essentially Catholic, is perfectly Protestant. We will go back for a few moments that we may contemplate her past, and thus seek to understand her present and her future. Removed by the distance of three centuries from a work everywhere impressed on our Liturgy and our Articles, we are forgetting the characteristics of that period which poured its new light over Christendom. It exhibited both thoughtful wisdom and daring courage. It was bold and prudent, radical and conservative, revolutionary and constructive. It is most singularly distinguished in Art, in Science, in Literature, for the tenacity with which it clung to the past, and the heroism with which it changed the present. It recognized those universal truths which the genius and piety of ancient times have clothed in eternal forms of beauty and of power, to live from age to age in the consciousness of mankind, an inspiration and a joy, and an immortality; and which you would no more seek to improve than the face of a star or the glory of the sun. When the awakened sixteenth century brushed the dust from the ancient classics it was not to despise their antiquity, but to study them as models. Recovered statues embodying ideals of womanly grace and manly majesty were not hurled from their pedestals, but made educators in the creation of a modern art. Crumbling architectural ruins were esteemed treasures whose grand suggestions instructed in shaping Christian temples of devotion. Bacon, who revolutionized science, exhibited in every masterly expression of his thoughts his admiration for the Greek and Roman writers. The greatness of a Period absolutely changing all the aspects and relations of philosophy, art, literature, government, religion, was evinced in nothing more than the wisdom with which it venerated ancient truth, and the courage with which it attempted every bold experiment. If continental Europe in some instances departed from these characteristics, they are fully exhibited by our noble English Reformers. They found Christianity overlaid with innumerable excrescences, which, deforming the tree, had not wholly arrested

its vital currents, and hence they sought not to force from the earth its connecting roots, but to tear away unnatural additions which impaired growth and destroyed productiveness. They properly went back for their models to the apostolic age, as exhibiting the truest types of our holy religion, on the principle that those worlds receive the brightest beams which are nearest the sun. In their investigations they found themselves compelled to employ the Church as a witness. Would they settle the canon of Scripture? They must consult the Church, speaking through her venerated primitive writers. Would they determine whether infants are subjects of Baptism? As the Bible ordained nothing with an absolute certainty, they had recourse to the interpretation of the Church expressed in the early fathers. Would they find a warrant for the substitution of the Christian Sunday for the Jewish Sabbath? They consult the Church for authority in a change touching a sacred precept of the moral law. And on the same principles tempted by blind radicalism to set doctrine against government, and make truth everything and form nothing, when they found not an equal precision of ecclesiastical government in the New Testament as in the Old; they interpreted Holy Scripture not only by the Holy Ghost but by the Holy Church, testifying in a long unbroken line of pious, learned and unanimous authors, and affirmed that a constitution established by inspired apostles must be divine, and that three orders of ministry under the Old Dispensation were to be continued by three orders of ministers under the New Dispensation. For a proper interpretation of sacraments, they resorted to the same authority. Hence our historic past. Hence our regard for apostolic example. Hence our veneration for the church as the custodian and witness of the Scripture. Hence our esteem for the great creeds and the Ecumenical councils. Hence our reverence for sacraments. Hence our affection for that Episcopal succession whose living links bind us to the person of Jesus Christ, our Chief, our Divine, our Eternal Bishop. Hence is the fact that we find in our Prayer-book a reproduction of the Apostolic Church as seen everywhere in the pages of the Scriptures and the Fathers. Hence our presentation of those immortal Liturgies whose perfect forms express the consciousness of Christianity, and afford the only basis of its eventual reunion.

But while our Anglican Reformers exhibited their conservative love of the Past, they evinced their boldness in the Present by their resistanc of usurped authority unto chains, unto blood, unto fire. They found no trace in the Canonical Scripture, or in the Apostolic church of any supremacy, or any infallibility in any universal Bishop, separated from whose headship was everlasting death. They detected in no author of the first three centuries a single invocation of saint or angel. They discovered no evidence that the sacramental elements were converted by the word of a priest into a divine substance to be first adored, and then offered in sacrifice for the living and the dead, and then received through the lips into the body. They saw no reason to believe that the secrets of the heart should be forced from the tongue into mortal ears under pain of damnation, or that the payment of money should deliver from the punishment of flames. They perceived no chain on the Bible. They found no law substituting the will of man for the will of God. Yet they saw in their own time system on system of mediæval superstition and idolatry in both the Greek and Latin Churches, piled almost to heaven between the soul and the Saviour, enslaving the individual conscience, debasing the public morals, and retarding the very currents of eternal life. To purify the fountains of truth, to unseal the pages of Scripture, to hurl down an unlawful authority, to restore the Apostolic Church in its purity, its symmetry, its majesty, required a boldness of progressive movement we are beginning to undervalue. The advances of this nineteenth century are not in the face of racks, dungeons, chains, and flames. Life was given for an expurgated Liturgy, and a translated Bible. Modern improvements blessing with comfort, and enervating with luxury, have yet brought no head to the block, or body to the stake.

Now a movement began in England within a half century which sincerely started to revive Catholic Order, but which terminated in principles tending to overthrow Catholic Faith. It gradually assumed greater and greater hostility to the Protestant element in the Anglican Church, many of whose gifted children, logically true to their opinions, were hurried over to Rome. In a few years the doctrinal basis of the proposed Reform was almost wholly abandoned, and every inferior consideration seemed merged in the restoration of Mediæval Ritual, and desire for the reunion of

Christendom even at the sacrifice of every Protestant peculiarity, every Protestant sympathy, and every Protestant association. Can we wonder if under the assumed splendors of the Papacy genius was keen to detect the childishness and hollowness of the imitation? Can we wonder if manliness should suffer emasculation in a position so false and so unnatural? Can we wonder if the poor vulgar and the rich vulgar should be caught by the tinsel glitter of a gaudy Ritualism? Can we wonder if Rome should employ her Priests, knowing Anglican ways, surrounded by Anglican associations, possessing Anglican secrets, to recover her lost dominion in England? Can we wonder if under such advantages she should be fearfully and boastfully successful? She knows and we know how many and how brilliant have been her triumphs. A Protestant may well be startled when he finds what titles, what estates, what numbers have passed from the ranks of the British nobility under the banner of the Pope. An English pervert has been the most tireless advocate of the monstrous dogma of Infallibility.

Now it has not been the sturdy sons and daughters of the Aristocracy which have made changes so sickly and so alien. It is only the weak and silly flies which become caught in the nets of the spider. Mr. Disraeli has studied this class with every possible advantage. Against these his arrows are directed. He read the arts of Rome in entrapping vapid lords, and stupid ladies into reverence for Cardinals and obeisance to Popes, and he has simply exposed Jesuitical trickery in a way such people could understand. That he has successfully accomplished his task is proved by the way his satire is resented. If his characters are superficial, it is because their representatives are superficial. If conversations are vapid in the book, it is because they are vapid at the dinner table, and in the drawing-room, and on the croquet-lawn. If the deeper passions are not stirred, it is because there were no deeper passions to stir. If arguments are not employed, it is because there were no brains to comprehend arguments. If puppets in flashing splendor move stupidly through the volume, it is because puppets in flashing splendors move stupidly through the palace. If Lothair, a half educated Englishman, who would not complete his Oxford course, takes the hue of every society into which he may come, and falls in love with every pretty woman he meets, and is only saved from Radicalism, or from Romanism, by happening at last to be-

gaged to the splendid daughter of a Duke, it is because
e some just such simple fledglings among the British Aris-
who yet as a class, compare in manliness, and culture,
r other body of men in the world. We can imagine as the
esman sat at his desk creating so many vapidities, and un-
the tricks of Rome, he must have often laid down his pen
at the truthfulness of his own pictures. Possibly in no
aginable way could his end be so perfectly reached as by
l. A formal treatise would have had few readers. "Lo-
s devoured by the whole world. Two persons have most
blow because most injured by its descent—Cardinal Man-
d his infallible Holiness. We only wish the same work
e accomplished in America with the same success. We
ith here fascinated with the painted charms of the Babylon-
ian, and who long to kiss her lips, and embrace her

e parting with our subject we will venture a remark. This
e of action, but not an age of refinement. Liberties are
l in society which would once have been branded crimes.
leman may escort a lady in public while puffing his cigar,
pose while lighting his pipe under a cloud of tobacco smoke.
y have manners roughened, but literature has become less
Where is the delicacy of Scott? Where is the sensitive-
Irving? Where is the gallantry of Cooper? Slang has
d our dailies. Slang has invaded our weeklies. Slang
hed our monthlies. Slang has forced its way even into
rterlies. In essay, and novel, and treatise, and sermon we
g. With slang we fight, with slang we make love, and
es even with slang we die. Slang is tolerated in Church
als which a few years since would have been banished from
y newspaper. Slang is dash. Slang is wit. Slang is pro-
Slang is success. Slang is almost piety. In one particular
sraeli has made a mistake avoided by Mr. Reade, and by
lins. He has used no slang. Henceforth he must take
oach of being a gentleman—suspiciously "*respectable.*"

Art. II.—PROFESSOR GEORGE WILSON.

Memoir of George Wilson, M. D. F. R. S. E. Regius Professor of Technology in the University of Edinburgh and Director of the Industrial Museum of Scotland. By his Sister, Jessie Aitken Wilson. 8*vo. pp.* 544. *Edinburgh: Edmonson & Douglas,* 1860.

Memoir of Edward Forbes, F. R. S. Late Regius Professor of Natural History in the University of Edinburgh. By George Wilson and Archibald Geikie. 8*vo. pp.* 599. *Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.,* 1861.

Religio Chemici; Essays: By George Wilson. *small* 8*vo. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.,* 1861.

Counsels of an Invalid, Letters on Religious Subjects. By George Wilson. 16*mo. pp.* 260. *Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.,* 1862.

The Five Gateways of Knowledge. By George Wilson. 16*mo. pp.* 104. *Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.,* 1861.

The Progress of the Telegraph. By George Wilson. 16*mo. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.,* 1861.

We desire to bring before our readers some account of a recent Scotch chemist and physicist, a man whose name is well known in scientific circles and whose claims upon our notice are somewhat peculiar. Ten years have passed away since George Wilson died. His writings have now been published; and we have the opportunity in what is printed and known to give some impartial account of his career. The studies to which he chiefly gave himself, chemistry and its allied subjects, have advanced greatly since his death, and in some sense he was rather a pioneer in certain branches of research and applied science. We have only to look through the current numbers of that busy, ably conducted scientific weekly, *Nature*, to see how the subjects to which Professor Wilson gave his life as a Lecturer on Technology, have gained in importance and general interest. The time has come when our scientific philosophers are all duly honored, and when elaborate research in the more intricate departments of science is felt to bring substantial advantage to the public. The natural philosopher is no longer an alchemist trying impossible problems in his laboratory, but

her a man whose speculations do not go far from realities and ›se studies have a practical bearing upon matters of every-day ›rest. Such men were Wilson and Forbes and Faraday.

George Wilson was born in Edinburgh, February 21st, 1818,— › small a baby that baby garments had to be made expressly him,"—of parents in comfortable circumstances and good posi- ı. His mother was "regarded by all who knew her as a woman rare natural gifts, who zealously fostered in her children the e of knowledge which they inherited." He was a twin brother, d to this was attributed in part the "wonderful power of attach- ; himself and being personally loved, which was one of his 'ongest as it was one of his most winning powers." It was the stom of his mother to pay each night a visit to the little cot of r twin boys and repeat over them Jacob's blessing, "The God ich fed me all my life long, unto this day, the Angel that leemed me from all evil, bless the lads." So fascinating was this t George used to pretend to be asleep when his mother came, t he might enjoy it to the full. His nurse said in regard to fondness for books, "Oh, as for George he was aye to be seen ı corner, wi' a book as big's himsel'." He often told in after , with glee how his mother, remarking his diligent study of ›wn's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' at last, after silent rejoicings, ›ressed to him her satisfaction at his choice. "Oh mother," ı the reply, looking up with a bright face, "I am making a list he precious stones." Again he said to a lady friend, "Much my delight as a child arose out of natural history. It gives d to the imagination, and tempers the fairy books, of which many cannot be given to children." While pursuing his stu- ı at the Edinburgh High School, with his brother, Daniel Wil- ,* now Professor of English Literature in University College, ronto, Canada, they used to improve their weekly and vacation idays in rambles over the adjoining country, visiting mines, hering specimens in botany, geology and natural history, as a time. Once when they were eleven years old, George went by ıal boat to Glasgow. The way he conducted himself on board wed a striking feature of his later life, his unusual power of ning friends and acquiring information: "George placed him-

---

The author of the recent and best Life of the Poet Chatterton.

self side by side with the greatest person on board (the captain) and plied him with question after question till the moment he left the boat. Before leaving, he very politely went up to the captain and mate, and thanked them heartily for their attention and information. They both said they had never seen such a boy." "The key," a friend remarked, "to Mrs. Wilson's success in the education of her family was the love that she fostered among them, and the free discussion that she encouraged, she herself taking a part in all their pursuits and becoming young again for their sakes."

When only fourteen years old the question of a profession for George came up in the family circle, and following his own inclination, the boy selected that of a physician, and was soon bound out for a four years' apprenticeship in the Laboratory of the Royal Infirmary at Edinburgh. At the same time he was attending lectures on natural philosophy, and chemistry and anatomy, and was pursuing a partial course at the University. In his sixteenth year, the British Association held its first meeting in Edinburgh, and was an object of great interest to him, giving shape and consistency to many vague longings after scientific occupation and success in what so soon became the favorite pursuits of his life. During these years at the Infirmary and in the University, he was also widening his knowledge of literature. Among the books which he read with particular profit were De Quincey's Confessions of an Opium-Eater, Bulwer's Novels, and Sir Thomas Brown's Works. But the larger fruit of these days was the acquisition of scientific knowledge from every available source, and at that time these sources were only scanty. Some of the sciences were in their infancy, the microscope was comparatively unknown, and the lectures upon the different branches of study were meagre accounts of previous investigations.

The next step was to enter the laboratory of Dr. Christison as assistant. Here began his chemical studies on a larger scale. He describes himself in a letter to a friend as "buried in the difficulties of several of the physical sciences, changing from pharmacy to chemistry, from chemistry to physiology, or taking as refreshment the subtleties of logic or the elegancies of rhetoric." In the winter of 1837–38, when nineteen years of age he delivered a course of lectures in his father's house on the Chemistry of Natur-

an audience of persons a year or two older than himself. Thus began almost unconsciously the professional career in which he much excelled, that of a lecturer on physical science. Another e of his life at this time appears in an extract from a letter to brother Daniel, then living in London: "How I have wished be beside you when reading Lamb's letters, which, after read- ; all the reviews on them, I got hold of in reality last week. ey are most exquisite. I have laughed and giggled to myself er my solitary cup and wished I had been near to read them to u, and have a sympathizing agreement in praising them. Many them, I think, far excel his essays. The India House and the mple are now hallowed in my eyes, and if ever in London, I all take care to travel to them." In another letter to the same other he speaks of that religious use of natural science which he l so much to promote: "I have no altar to kneel at but my own dside, where I have often prayed to God for you, but there I ve prayed for success in my endeavors and *there*, should God ant me the honor of going deeper into His laws than others, I uld pour out my sincere thanks and gratitude." He is w deeply engaged in a series of experiments on bromine, ough yet a youth under twenty, and of these he says: "My only pe, and it is a feeble one, of getting on as a Chemist is to suc- ed in some project which shall convince unwilling friends that I ve some chance of success in such a profession, and this I must before I pass as physician, for *that* consummated I must at once gin for myself in some capacity." Again he is studying geolo- , but is miserable "from want of my laboratory and means to y, by the test of experiments the projects of my brain." In the oratory, he says, "I must have no one overlooking, even ndly."

He next went to London and became an assistant in the labo- tory of Prof. Graham without a salary. Medicine was less at- ctive than before. He attempted a little practice before he left me and came to this decision: "I was never made to be a phy- ian." Prof. Graham was then Professor of Chemistry in Univer- y College, and no place in England presented a better opportuni- for acquiring the knowledge of analysis and the other branches chemistry. Among the students at that time was Dr. Livingstone, e African explorer, with whom young Wilson became intimate.

Here he prepared his first Thesis on "The Existence of Haloid Salts of the Electro-Negative Metals in Solution." The advantages of Prof. Graham's laboratory were not so great as he expected, but he gained other important benefits during his stay in London, and among the chief of these was his introduction to Faraday, and his attending one of his brief courses of Lectures on Electricity at the Royal Institution. The subject and the lecturer alike furnished a rich treat to the young chemist. Faraday delighted him in all ways; a self-made man, and yet with a manner so modest and a bearing so kindly to the eager inquiring youth; and the lectures were a pleasure of the highest kind and full of profit to him afterwards in various ways. Soon after, he went home and passed his examination for a medical degree, a necessary step even in his own cherished purpose of becoming a lecturer upon chemistry.

The plan of a young man, now twenty-one, and in the full flush of abounding promise is "to appear as a lecturer on some provincial arena in the winter." Within a month after receiving his diploma he attended the British Association convened at Birmingham in company with his friend and fellow-graduate, Samuel Brown. He next wanders to the great metropolis and seeks out Faraday who "showed me his whole laboratory with labors going on, and talked frankly and kindly, but to the usual question of something to do gave the usual round O answer. Returning home, he joined the "Brotherhood of Truth," a society founded by the late Edward Forbes when a student at the University, and numbering during the lifetime of these men many of the leaders in the scientific circles of Great Britain. This is the period of looking for something to do; and every straw is eagerly caught at. He soon became President of the Physical Society, which brought him before the public, and says of himself, "There is some prospect afar off, but not uncertain, of lecturing being got, so that I work hopefully onwards." In the beginning of the year 1840 a bright spot becomes visible in the horizon. There was an opportunity to teach chemistry in Edinburgh the next winter. This opening was a license as a lecturer on chemistry from the Royal College of Surgeons, and though nameless and with little influence no other could have offered similar advantages. It introduced him to the

notice of the University, and was a place where any deficiencies would not be made too prominent.

For his lectures he made elaborate preparation, and this was the secret in fact of that easy use of varied information which marked all his public performances. In June, 1840, he says, "I work steadily at my lectures, writing and reading often for eight or ten hours a day. I find that the undertaking is a more serious one than it seemed at first. But I don't flinch and hope to get on bravely." At the same time in the society of Edward Forbes, John Cairns, Sir William Hamilton and many lesser lights he was fast ripening into literary manhood. He at once became a favorite lecturer, though now only twenty-two. He delighted to impart to others the knowledge he possessed, and by the wonderful law of sympathy this delight communicated itself to his audience. While unfolding with patient care the deeper laws of his favorite science, flashes of wit and fancy lighted up the subject. A sweet voice added to the charm; and foreign students with an imperfect knowledge of English were often advised to attend him in preference to other teachers as being more easily followed. Prof. Forbes said in 1844, "Wilson is one of the best lecturers I ever heard, reminding me more of the French school than our humdrum English, and is a man of high literary taste and great general knowledge." A letter written in March, 1842, discloses the young chemist in the full glow of work: "I propose in summer to begin a special course, addressed chiefly to the senior students and medical men, on animal chemistry, a subject of great importance, at which I have been diligently laboring all the winter. I shall bring before them a new and highly important branch of chemistry never properly studied in this country. The medical men themselves are very anxious about it, and it was the solicitation of others that first urged me to it. My own tastes lead me to other departments, but poverty precludes their prosecution at present, and this is really as rich and noble a field as any, and grows every day more interesting to me." Dr. John Cairns said of his introductory lecture: "I never admired anything more than his firmness in writing down the agonies of pain. I heard his opening lecture on animal chemistry with great interest and instruction. He has a very fine and penetrating mind, and is marked out for eminence. We are getting wonderfully intimate, and I enjoy no-

body's society more." Thus in his native city, though yet in a very humble way and a mere youth in years, had George Wilson already asserted the genius that was in him and marked out for himself the path by which he was to achieve distinction.

We turn now to another phase of his life. About the time he became a public lecturer, he began to suffer from ill health. In March, 1842, he says of himself, "For the last five weeks I have not had a night's unbroken sleep through pain, and even the repose, such as it was, has been procured only by the nightly use of morphine. Even so late as a week ago, I had to stop in the middle of a lecture overcome with a severe paroxysm, and go straight home." Yet in such health he was speaking four hours *per diem*, with an audience overflowing, crammed to the door, and scarcely even standing room to be had, and says of himself, "That nature which has given horns to bulls has given me a tongue which nothing but death can keep from wagging." He was suffering from rheumatism, from very weak eyes; and an abscess was gathering about the heel of his foot, where some time before there had been a sprain, in which he had taken cold. He was required to prepare on very short warning, for the loss of a limb by amputation. The only alternative was death; and it was so doubtful whether he would survive the operation that he asked for a week to prepare for death and what lies beyond it. He had always lived a good moral life, but now almost face to face with death, all the great realities of religion came pressing upon him with unwonted force. In regard to this change he himself said, "It pleased God, who speaks to some with the still small voice of gentle persuasion, to address me in the whirlwind and the storm, and to vouchsafe me, in the prospect of sore trial, a calmness, even a serenity and patience which could have been supplied me from no other source." This serenity and patience did not pass away with the partial recovery of health, but became habitual to him as long as he lived. We now enter upon the stage of his life when he lived like a dying man. Not long after the amputation, he discovered that his lungs were diseased, and henceforth existence was to him a continual struggle, the question being how with a very limited amount of physical power he could accomplish the purposes of an unusually active and energetic mind. In fact, the very lesson of such a notice as we are here giving of Prof. Wilson's life is the way in

which he performed his daily tasks and made his life cheerful and useful, though himself suffering from almost constant pain. Such a record of good done for man, amid so much personal trial, we have very seldom known; and this now marked feature of his character will appear in strong relief as we give further glimpses from the very ample Memoir before us.

When the winter of 1842–43 opened upon him, his professional duties were increased by his appointment as lecturer on Chemistry to the Edinburgh Veterinary College, and by a similar appointment to the School of Arts. A course of lectures to young ladies at the Scotch Institution on Saturdays was also begun in November, so that altogether he was delivering ten lectures a week. To his sister he writes: "You will not suspect me of vanity, if I tell you of a thing or two about my lectures. I have twenty students at my 10 A. M. medical class; forty at my twelve o'clock (three days a week) veterinary class; some hundred young ladies at the Scottish Institution; and some two hundred stout fellows at the School of Arts." Of the latter class, which was his favorite, he said: "My great pleasure in it is lecturing to the working people, to whom I may do intellectual and moral service." His sister says, "His lectures were usually delivered from notes, and a few of those written for this audience, and used for no other, remain as evidence that some of the finest specimens of his powers as a speaker were elicited by this favorite class. The enthusiasm with which they responded was abundantly proved by the band of chemists which then began to form, many of whom have forsaken all else to prosecute this branch of science, both in its scientific and its practical departments; while it would be vain to attempt a calculation of those whose minds were elevated by its study, pursued after days of toil." One of his pupils comparing these lectures with those subsequently delivered as Professor of Technology in the University said: "There was the same power of riveting the attention of his audience, nay almost fascinating them; the same playful fancy and poetical prose in his prelections; the same Christian Catholicity of heart; the genial sympathy with the 'pursuit of knowledge under difficulties;' the same familiar, homely mode of illustration; the same aptitude in experiment; the same affability to his most humble and obscure student. These qualities combined to render him at once the greatest favorite and

the most efficient teacher among his colleagues at the School of Art."

In the summer of 1844 he was baptized by immersion, "having satisfied myself that it was the scriptural and most ancient method" * * * though "inclining strongly to consider the mode unimportant, and to believe that affusion of water is all that is implied in the idea of baptism." He subsequently united himself with the Congregational Society, under the care of the present popular Dr. W. L. Alexander. In earlier life he had admired the Church above all other religious bodies, even going so far as to say of the London Clergy whom he heard preach, that "in meekness, simplicity, and earnestness of purpose, they cannot well be surpassed by the ministers of any denomination," but there is no evidence that his early baptist training ever broke away enough for his clear understanding of the true principles of the Church. We cannot the less, however, concede to him a very bright and pure Christian example as one of the few scientific men who carried his religion into all his studies, and made them the instruments of setting forth God's goodness and love. No one can read the addresses which now remain and which were first delivered to medical classes on the religious bearings of the medical profession, or call to mind his readiness to give lectures to aid the poor, or struggling home-mission work, or Sunday or apprentice schools; nor can any one look over the delightful *Counsels of an Invalid*, the letters which a sick man wrote to comfort others, sick like himself, without feeling that George Wilson brought down the rich treasures of science to the humblest capacity, and lived not for self alone. A gifted man of letters observed that "few indeed are the sermons which we read that can leave so deep an impression of reverence for Him whose works science interprets as did the simplest of George Wilson's compositions. In listening to Wilson, you not only increased your knowledge, your store of facts, but you were delighted with the beauty and harmony of their relations and interdependence."

These remarks are amply borne out by the very popular little essay, *The Five Gateways of Knowledge*, in which he lectures upon the five senses. An extract where he dwells upon the hand as the organ of touch, gives a good specimen, not only of his

prose style, but of that constant higher suggestion and purpose which runs like a thread of gold through all his writings:

"The hand is emphatically the organ of touch, not merely because the tips of the fingers, besides being richly endowed with those nerves which confer sensitiveness upon the skin of the whole body, possess in addition an unusual supply of certain minute auxiliary bodies called 'tactile corpuscles,' but because the arrangement of the thumb and fingers and the motions of the wrist, elbow and arm, give the hand a power of accommodating itself spontaneously to surfaces, which no other part of the body possess. Moreover, when we speak of the hand as the organ of touch, we do not refer merely to the sensitiveness of the skin of the fingers, but also to that consciousness of pressure upon them in different directions, by means of which we largely judge of form. When a blind man, for example, plays a musical instrument, he is guided in placing his fingers, not merely by the impression made upon the skin of them, but also by impressions conveyed through the skin to those little bundles of flesh called muscles, which move the fingers. Were it possible to deprive the hands of their skin without inflicting pain, we should retain the muscular touch, and with it the power of playing.

"In many respects the organ of touch as embodied in the hand, is the most wonderful of the senses. The organs of the other senses are passive; the organ of touch alone is active. The eye, the ear, and the nostril, stand simply open; light, sound and fragrance enter, and we are compelled to see, to hear, and to smell, but the hand selects what it shall touch and touches what it shall please. It puts away from it the things which it hates, and beckons towards it the things which it desires; unlike the eye, which must often gaze transfixed at horrible sights from which it cannot turn; and the ear, which cannot escape from the torture of discordant sounds; and the nostril, which cannot protect itself from hateful odors.

"Moreover, the hand cares not only for its own wants, but when the other organs of the senses are rendered useless, takes their duties upon it. The hand of the blind man goes with him as an eye through the streets, and safely threads for him all the devious way; it looks for him at the faces of his friends, and tells him whose kindly features are gazing upon him; it peruses books for him, and quickens the long hours by its silent readings. It ministers as willingly to the deaf; and when the tongue is dumb and the ear stopped, its fingers speak eloquently to the eye, and enable it to discharge the unwonted office of a listener.

"The organs of all the other senses also, even in their greatest perfection, are beholden to the hand for the enhancement and the exaltation of their powers. It constructs for the eye a copy of itself, and thus gives it a telescope to range among the stars; and by another copy on a slightly different plan, furnishes it with a microscope, and introduces it into a new world of wonders. It constructs for the ear the instruments by which it is educated, and sounds them in its hearing till its powers are drained to the full. It plucks for the nostril the flower which it longs to smell, and distils for it the fragrance which it covets. As for the tongue, if it had not the hand to

serve it, it might abdicate its throne as the Lord of Taste. In short, the organ of touch is the minister of its sister senses, and without any play of words, is the handmaid of them all.

"And if the hand thus munificently serves the body, not less amply does it give expression to the genius and the wit, the courage and the affection, the will and the power of man. Put a sword into it, and it will fight for him; put a plough into it, and it will till for him; put a harp into it and it will play for him; put a pencil into it and it will paint for him; put a pen into it and it will speak for him, plead for him, pray for him. What will it not do? What has it not done? A steam engine is but a larger hand, made to extend its powers by the little hand of man. An electric telegraph is but a long pen for that little hand to write with. All our huge cannons and other weapons of war, with which we so effectually slay our brethren, are only Cain's hand made bigger and stronger and bloodier. What, moreover, is a ship, a railway, a lighthouse, or a palace—what, indeed, is a whole city, a whole continent of cities, all the cities of the globe, nay, the very globe itself, in so far as man has changed it, but the very work of that giant hand, with which the human race, acting as one mighty man, has executed its will.

"*When I think of all that man and woman's hand had wrought from the day when Eve put forth her erring hand to pluck the fruit of the forbidden tree, to that dark hour when the pierced hands of our Saviour were nailed to the predicted tree of shame, and of all that human hands have done of good and evil since, I lift up my hand and gaze upon it with wonder and with awe.*"

You cannot go far in any of Prof. Wilson's writings without coming upon sentences like the last, not even in his purely scientific essays, when a religious use of facts is hardly to be expected; and they show the strong tendency of his mind to utilize and elevate every subject which he took hold of. From *The Progress of the Telegraph* passages similar in the manner of illustration might be taken, but the above is the only passage we have room for as setting forth his prose style; and what a style is this, so clear, so simple, so fresh, so fascinating! We need not wonder that he held audiences as if with a charmed spell when his written or spoken style was in such a vein. It was his purpose in the latter years of his life to write a work which should in some respects be a parallel volume to Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*, and to it he gave the name *Religio Chemici*. This volume of essays was published with such a title after his death, but the essays which make up the work had been mostly written several years before. After reading some of them Lord Jeffrey, who was his intimate friend, wrote: "They give me a very high opinion

not only of Dr. Wilson's talents and learning, but of his taste and power of writing. His severer style is admirable, and nothing can be better than the lucid and energetic brevity with which he abstracts facts and condenses arguments." Those scientific memoirs on Dalton, Cavendish, Wollaston and Boyle, show a range of reading and a power of clear statement not often combined in the treatment of any science. His favorite study was scientific history and biography, and he had it in mind to write the lives of the distinguished chemists of Britain, of which work these memoirs were to form a part; but the design was never fulfilled. Three essays in this volume are respectively on *Chemistry and Natural History*, *The Chemistry of the Stars*, and *Chemical Final Causes*. The first boldly grapples with the difficulty arising from the presence of evil as well as good in the manifestations of a design, and contains a vivid reflection of his own experience of suffering. The next is an endeavor to determine the extent to which we can ascertain the relative difference of chemical composition between the earth and the heavenly bodies. In the third, he attempts to add to the ever-accumulating proofs of design by showing especially that phosphorus, nitrogen and iron, are the best adapted of the known elements for the purposes they are required to fulfill in animal organisms. The whole volume is not only valuable in itself as a contribution to useful speculation and scientific history, but as showing that rare ability as a teacher which is now chiefly the tradition of those who heard his lectures. There is no more attractive or profitable scientific reading than what he has written. A further work in biography was the *Life of Edward Forbes*, only six chapters of which did he live to complete, though the work has been very ably finished by another hand. There is no monograph concerning the Isle of Man, the birthplace of Forbes, which is equal to the first chapter of this memoir, and the work itself as much reveals the genial heart and gay humor of Wilson as the gradual education of a great naturalist. It is one of the happiest specimens of a compact and readable biography of a scientific man which we know of. One would say that Prof. Wilson had taken good, honest Isaac Walton, for his model, and few who take up this memoir will lay it down till they have reached the last page.

But we turn again to the narrative of Wilson's own life. In the

spring of 1846 he gave in addition to his usual and regular courses of lectures, a short course on the "Relation of Physical Science to the doctrines mooted in the Vestiges of the Natural History of the Creation," which was largely attended, and which six publishing houses offered to print without delay, but he put them aside till he could divest them of a polemical form, and the leisure never came to give them the proper shape. Speaking to Dr. Cairns of these lectures he said: "I have too much wrought only at science and literature, hoping thereby to secure a position which would enable me to serve Christ effectually. But many things warn me that my life will be a short one, and that what I can do must be done swiftly." This "slight opportunity of doing a little good," however, cost him a severe illness of some months. In 1849 his *Text Book on Chemistry*, a work which in nine years circulated to the extent of 24,000 copies, was prepared for the press by dictation at his summer retreat, whither he had taken himself for the summer, because rheumatism and general feebleness had compelled the abandonment of his spring classes. Idleness was to him an impossibility, and this work was undertaken as the only occupation of which he was then capable. He was quite unable to hold a pen for months, and dictated his pages to his sister, while pacing the room with compressed lips that showed the pain could scarcely be endured, but pain did not stop the work nor interfere in the making of a very useful book. His investigations on *Color Blindness* added as much as anything to his scientific reputation. He demonstrated the fact that very many people are color-blind, and applied his investigations to shipping and railways, and to all kinds of signal telegraphing, in a way to permanently benefit mankind. This was indeed a prominent feature in Prof. Wilson's character, the desire to utilize every subject, and to turn it, if possible, to practical account; and this quality of his mind undoubtedly led to his appointment in 1855 to the then newly-founded Chair of Technology in the University, a post which he held with great credit to himself and with great general usefulness till his death in November, 1859. This Professorship was connected with the office of Director of the Industrial Museum of Scotland, and in both these positions he seemed to have found his proper place. For Wilson did not excel so much as an investigator into the unexplored branches of science as in the illustration and application

truths and facts already discovered. This chair of Technology him to make these applications in the medium ground between re science and industrial pursuits, and at once brought into use extensive practical knowledge and his peculiar aptness in king it popular. Accordingly he soon made this Chair bene- al to all classes, and especially to those not pursuing full courses study. The professions represented in his class were those of "general manufacturer, architect, engineer, farmer, merchant, er, tanner, sugar-planter, sugar-refiner, teacher, doctor and gyman, besides young men entered simply as students, but fly training for industrial callings." He had about forty lents for his first course. His syllabus required three years to ver its contents. At first the branch of teaching was so new o keep away students, but as the years went on it became the t successful professorship in the University, and acquired ost a European fame. How extensive was the ground which actions occupied, appears from the following extract from his s syllabus:

The course was divided into mineral, vegetable, and animal technol- . Under the first were included the relation of the atmosphere, the n and tributary waters, and the earth to Technology; and among ial subjects, fuel, building material, glass and glass-making, pottery, henware and porcelain; metalotechny, electrotechny, and magneto- ny. Under the second or vegetable technology, were considered sac- o-amylaceous substances, sugar-making, albuminous substances and entation, distillation, wood and wood fibres, textile tissues, bleaching, ng, calico-printing, paper-making, scriptorial or graphic industrial arts, tchouc, gutta-percha, and the resins, fats and oils. Under the third on, or animal technology, were included the mechanical application chemical products of bones, ivory, horns, hoofs, tortoise-shell, shells corals; skins, tanning, fish-scales, hair, fur, wool, bristles, quills and ers, animal refuse."

eyond this brief synopsis he was continually branching off special subjects connected with his general theme, so that his ge of topics was almost as unbounded as the general influence uch technics in developing the industrial energies of the people. said of his course in 1858:

finished, a week ago, my third course on Technology. I have changed subject each year, and have now completed the round of vegetable, eral and animal industrialism, and know my ground. There are fearful to fill up and a thousand things to learn, but I have had some of the

same men all the three years, and have interested even soap-makers in soap-making."

In September, 1857, he wrote to his friend, Dr. Gladstone:

"I am rather digesting plans than carrying them out. A President's Address, a Syllabus, three special Lectures on Paper, Pens and Ink, one on Industrial Museums, and a course of prelections on Technology, are at present simmering together in my head like the diversified contents of Meg Merrillies' gipsy camp-kettle. To-morrow, when the new month comes in, I'll begin ladling them off into separate pots and pans, and fall to the process of cooking properly so called. Meanwhile I am chiefly occupied with Forbes' Life and Directorial Correspondence."

Such was one side of his active life; yet all this time he was in a very low state of health. He said of the following winter:

"That much of it was spent in bed, and much of it in doing work with an effort." At another time he wrote: "I live from day to day, feeling my hold upon life, but happy many times and for long hours, although my temperament is not one which even the choicest mercies could rob of its native inquietude and sensitiveness. But all is well. I have great holes in my heart, and dreary voids in my affections; but on this side of the grave they cannot be filled, and I will work as hard as I can till the manumission comes."

When the Chair of Technology had been accepted by him, he wrote:

"With unfeigned sincerity I can say that I have rejoiced at the prospect of serving my Saviour more and better through the influence it may give me, and the prayer is often on my lips and oftener in my heart, that I may be made bold and wise enough to confess Him before men. I see so many of my scientific and literary friends devoured by the cares of the world and fretted by its little troubles, that I tremble lest I too become a selfish, scheming worldling."

In 1859 he said:

"The meaning of life, the purpose of God, the worth of this world and the next, have all risen into a prominence which they had not formerly displayed. I was not expecting or seeking this. It came upon me like the wind blowing where it listeth."

And again:

"My physical activities and locomotive powers steadily abridge their circle of energy."

Again he says of the 15th chapter of Corinthians:

"It stirs me like a trump of doom. I cannot read it aloud without finding my voice break down; all the immortal dead I know seem to gather

ut me as its mingled pathos and jubilation, and summons, sound out n its solemn diapason. Tears and confusion and thanksgiving take the ce of articulate didactic words, and the image of the heavenly obliterates else."

This strong religious feeling appears in all his most familiar ters, and amid constant and most pressing occupations; indeed, lived daily like a dying man, and yet with the most ample joyments of life.

The end was now very near. He had not yet reached his forty-ond year, but the light of life was burning low in the sockets, d he himself felt that he might be called away at any time. A rere cold taken in the latter part of November 1859 soon de-loped into pleurisy, and in two or three days the end came, not looked for and with his interest in life unabated till the last. They are not up in the Atomic theory," said the Professor, when sister attempted to restrain him from overtaxing his strength delivering his last lecture; and even in his final hours, while . Cairns and other friends conversed with him about the great rney and his sister read to him such passages from Holy Scrip-e as could comfort a dying man, he still wished the choice ngs to be read to him from the unfailing *Athenæum* of the week; l then the end came and the golden bowl was broken, and George lson's spirit had gone to another home.

Thus lived and died a man who carried into all the diversified suits of an influential calling a pure and holy consecration of mind's best energies to Christ. He deserves the name of the gious chemist. He imparted to all his work a moral purpose. paid very little for self. It can be easily seen that such a would be beloved, and the spontaneous mourning of the whole of Edinburgh when he died, a thousand persons following his ains to the final home, was a witness to the fact. Wherever went, he attracted people to him and children especially. ough excused by bodily infirmity from an active share in pub-affairs, his unconquerable energy triumphed over physical suf-ng, and he accomplished more than many men who hardly w the feeling of pain. Though gifted as a literary man and to remembered as one of the very best expositors of scientific re-rch, though a poet too and a humorist, though very highly ed in almost every department of mental work to which he

gave his attention, his patient devotion to studies which benefit man, his rare purity and elevation of character, his silent victory over pain and disease, the prevailing tone of religious thought which pervades all, are his highest claims to renown and make him one of the leading scientific lay-preachers of his age. May many another George Wilson be found among those who now give so much thought to physical science.

ART. III.—PAUL AND TERTIUS, OR SCIENCE AND REVELATION.

A TRACT FOR THE TIMES.

WE hope that none of our readers will turn from our Article because of the triteness of the subject we have named at the head of it. Doubtless much has been written and spoken on this subject, —much wisely and well said—some things not so wisely and well. But much remains to be said before the human mind will be satisfied and all dispute, doubt and controversy cease. And we write in the hope that we will be able in the course of our Article to say some things that have not been said before; and above all to say some things which all right-minded persons and all lovers of truth will in the end confess to have been well said. Nay, in the exercise of what may not be regarded as an altogether intolerable self-conceit, we trust that what we have to say may be considered as we have more than truly called it, "A tract for the times"—perhaps even in view of all the circumstances of the case "*the* tract for the times" for all persons who are theologically inclined, whether believingly or skeptically so inclined.

We have expressed our belief that not all has been said on the relation of Science to Revelation which the subject admits of—nor yet all that those who are interested in the subject at all, are anxious to hear: *the one thing* that they want to hear and read, has not yet appeared either as written or spoken: for if it had, of course, everybody would be satisfied and there would be no more desire to read or hear on the subject: no more desire even to write or to speak: all would acquiesce in the view presented, and all would be satisfied.

Iow, in the outset, let us distinctly note the fact that, beyond question, there is such a thing as an "*evil heart of unbelief*" onsequence of there are many who don't want to believe Revelation, and who therefore will either discover or invent difIties in the way of belief not easy to remove, because those feel troubled by such difficulties don't want to have them oved. We believe that these are very few. We have never or known *one*—who really wanted to believe in Christianity ccept it as a rule of life and a ground of hope in death, that nd any real or serious obstacle in the way of his doing so, in of the scientific difficulties, whether physical or metaphysical, t any thing calling itself science has ever presented. We say t we have never seen such persons. But we are willing to nit for argument's sake that there may have been such. And 'ein is the chief difficulty of our subject, to convince those that 'n't want to be convinced—to cure those who do not want to be l of their disease.

.n the next place let us carefully note, that the relations of ence and Revelation, whether of harmony or contradiction, not be settled fully, ultimately and satisfactorily, *in the old hod at least*, until both Science and Revelation are thoroughly lerstood and rightly understood. Go back in the history of ught and opinion four or five hundred years, and there was no picion of any contrariety. In fact, Physical Science, proly so called, scarcely existed. With the commencement of culture a new method was introduced and thereafter two hods of opposite characters and diverse tendencies were in among men: the *theologic* which reasoned from authority, by of interpretation and dogmatism, and the *scientific* which soned by way of observation, and induction and inference. was not possible in the nature of things that those engaged these two different methods respectively, should not show h of them a little preference for his own acquired by habit use—and a little jealousy of the other. Instead there- of working in harmony there would be at work a tendency to nation, a tendency to find and magnify discrepancies, the ologians would denounce the *savans* as skeptic, infidel, &c., &c.; the men of science would distrust the theologians, regard m as bigots—possibly as hypocritical impostors—and them-

selves become skeptical, unbelieving, and perhaps as the theologians had resorted to excommunication and denunciation,—the skeptics would resort to scoffing and ridicule.

Meanwhile the status of both parties is changing; the men of science have found, and have compelled all men to acknowledge that certain facts contrary to what the theologians had held, are unquestionably true, such as the roundness of the earth and its revolution on its axis, about the sun,—the greater antiquity of the earth than the six thousand years which the theologians—resting as they supposed on revelation—had ascribed to it. And now they came forward with the claim that not only the earth has existed for unaccountable millions of years, but that man has existed on its surface for at least many tens of times the six thousand years that the theologians allow, and as a consequence that the first chapters of Genesis, at least those giving an account of the creation and early condition of men, cannot be accepted as historically true. Will they succeed? We do not propose to answer or discuss that question here at all. But whether they do or do not, will this be the last question of the kind they will raise? Who can tell? Manifestly therefore the relation between Science and Revelation cannot be settled or understood thoroughly and satisfactorily until Science itself shall have completed her list of alleged contradictions to Revelation and—what is more—settled it with herself how she will have these facts regarded—what is in truth her own mind and position in regard to them.

On the other hand Theology has changed its grounds. When Copernicus, Galileo and others insisted that the earth was a revolving globe the Theologians thought that Revelation taught the contrary, and that the point could not be conceded to Science without abandoning the whole ground covered by Revelation and giving up the very foundations of faith and hope. But the scientific fact prevailed, faith and hope are not given up—nor are the arguments in favor of Revelation considered as altogether, or even at all shaken or weakened by the success of science. Theologians however have come to see and confess, what they either did not then think of or would not confess—that the sacred writers were not teaching Astronomy and Physical Geography—but Theology, —"not" as has been said "how the heavens go, but how men may go to heaven." So too with regard to the other fact named.

The *time* of the creation of the earth. When Dr. Chalmers—after the controversy had raged for more or quite a century without abatement or prospect of an end, declared that "the Book of Genesis was not intended to settle the matter of chronology—not to tell men *when* God created the heavens and earth, but the fact that He created them," he made a concession that Theologians—under the pressure of growing conviction—now become an acknowledged fact that the earth is older than six thousand years, have been glad to acquiesce in, and under shelter of which they have been able to renew, for a time at least successfully, their defence of Revelation as being a credible as well as a credited fact. Shall we be obliged to go one step further and acknowledge that Moses in the first chapters of Genesis did not intend to write the *history* of creation, but rather the *theology* of it? That he aimed not to give us either the chronology or the actual historic facts of the creation and early conditions of the earth and of men upon it, but rather the theological doctrines that it and they *were* created, that man was at first sinless and then became a sinner, and the consequence of this change, that God, the Creator, exercises not only a moral government over but also a Father's love towards man, and that He is a proper object of love, worship and obedience for all mankind? That in fact Moses had no more thought or design of writing *history* in the first part of Genesis than our Lord had of adding to our stores of historic fact, in His parable of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son and the Virgins? The question will startle many; and it ought to do so. But it is a question proposed by many, and one which if the mere claim to the great antiquity of man set forth by the geologists of our day, shall come to be accepted as indisputable fact, must be considered and answered. But all this is merely preliminary to our main purpose, and to show that if Scientific men are not quite prepared yet to show us their *ultimatum*, so on the other hand we, Theologians, must not overlook the fact that we have facts and questions of our own to discuss, consider and settle before we are prepared to exhibit our last word or concession, the statement of our position most favorable to a reconciliation with Science—the position we can occupy so as not to be overcome and overwhelmed with defeat in the controversy now seen and felt by all to be inevitable and immediately impending.

For, be it considered in view of the past, a scientific fact when fairly ascertained and universally accepted as such, is the most controlling thing in the world. All the theories and practices of men must conform to it. Men will not believe Theology if Theology says in this age, as it did three centuries ago, that the earth is flat and stationary, with sun, moon and stars revolving about it daily. Men will not believe Theologians if they insist that the earth has not existed and been inhabited by living creatures, more than any six, or eight, or ten thousand years. Men, sensible men, will indeed be *slow* to believe that *men* have lived on the earth more than six thousand years if Theologians assure them that such is the fact, and that this assurance rests upon Revelation. But men do not, men will not, men cannot resist the advancing discoveries of science. It was more than a century after Galileo, before his theory of the earth's movements was accepted by all, so as to become a part of the common thought of men. Even Milton, in his Paradise Lost, found the old theory better for his purposes and not too universally abandoned to be unfit for his use. It was more than one hundred and fifty years after the Italian geologists of Verona—1517—claimed that they had found *fossil* remains which indicated a successive order of creation, and greater antiquity than that commonly assigned by Theologians to the earth's existence, before the doctrine was commonly accepted, or had ceased to be an object of distrust and denunciation with the advocates of Revelation, as against the claims and pretensions of science. And while the advocates and students of science have held many false and absurd theories, which scientific men themselves of their own, or the next age, have refuted, and while they have claimed many facts that have turned out to be no facts, we must remember and consider well and profit by the consideration, too, the following facts: 1. No theory or pretended fact of science has ever been disproved, refuted or abandoned on account of any argument drawn from Theology or Revelation against it, but solely and purely on scientific grounds alone. And 2. When any fact has been established in the common consent and estimation of scientific men, in the department of science to which it pertains, it has soon come to be accepted by all men in all departments of science, and Theologians have found some way of reconciling Revelation with the accepted fact of

science. Of course we do not say that facts of science, or rather phenomena and theories claimed as such, which have been opposed on theological grounds, have not been abandoned as untenable and untrue; but it was not for the theological objections or oppositions that they have been abandoned. They were abandoned for want of scientific support, or on account of opposition of scientific facts; not at all or in any case from the opposition of Theology or Revelation. This statement which we believe to be incontrovertible and true without a single exception, should be allowed to teach us a most needed and a most salutary lesson. Science has her own methods and criteria, and will not depart from them, whether she ought to or not. Facts are stubborn and obstinate things, and he that comes into conflict with them or allows himself to infringe upon them, is sure to get the worst of it.

This then is the first point in our Article—namely, that in any conflict between a fact of Science and a dogma of Theology, where the fact is indubitably established by the methods of science and by scientific men, the dogma of the Theologians must go under and give way, notwithstanding any pretence of Revelation they may adduce in favor of their position.

We pass then to our second point—the *actual* relation of Revelation and Science.

And here we do not propose to enter into detail or to discuss at all any particular subject or fact in regard to which the teachings of the two respectively may be thought to be in contrariety. We propose to suggest a general view that will, as we believe, serve to explain them all—that is, *after* both science and theology have done their proper work in correcting their own errors and prepared for the contrast—not to say contest—their ultimate and most exact statements. And in speaking of Revelation in this connection we do not intend to assume or to repudiate any particular theory of inspiration. We speak rather of what the writers of the Bible had in mind when they wrote the sacred pages—or what they may be supposed to have intended in what they say.

And our proposition is that the relation or attitude of the facts of science and the statements of the sacred writers is not one of contradiction or contrariety even, when properly considered, but

rather it is that of two persons giving explanations of the same thing from different points of view. In a distinct and scientific statement we say that while the writers of Revelation speak of the facts and phenomena of Nature from the point of view of the Efficient Cause, the writers of Science speak of the same facts from the point of view of the Occasional or Instrumental Causes.

Take as an illustration. We suppose that all persons believe that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans, and constantly speak of him as the author of that Epistle. But in the Epistle itself it is expressly declared that "I Tertius wrote it." (Rom. xvi. 22.) Are we wrong? Did Tertius write the epistle in any such way or sense, as that St. Paul was not its author? And did he not "write" it too? The question is easily settled, and has long been settled. Tertius "wrote" it as *amanuensis;* St. Paul as *author.* The Apostle as efficient cause, his friend and amanuensis as instrumental cause; they both wrote it, but each in a different sense of the word from the other.

Let us look at the facts. The Scripture writers knew nothing of science as we use the word in these days; nothing of its formulæ, its terms, and almost nothing of its facts. They regarded GOD as the only cause, His will as the only law, and consequently they spoke of everything as His act, His doing; everything at least that was considered good and beneficial in its results. But with the modern *savan,* intent upon the pursuit of science, it is far otherwise. The very first step in his method is to look at the facts, to observe their laws, and to investigate their causes. But what are causes? Why, the next fact before any one that had a tendency or agency in producing it; and laws are but the modes and ways in which these causes or forces act. The next step, however, carries the student of science out of the domain of *his* department entirely, and across its boundary into the domain of metaphysics. He passes a boundary for the most part without so much as getting his passport *visèd,* or even having a passport at all; and what is worse, without taking the slightest notice of the laws and manners and customs of the new country into which he has entered. He passes from the consideration of concrete substances to the speculation about invisible forces, and force in general. Thus he sees that objects that are warmer or hotter than those around them always produce certain effects upon them;

warmth expands, perhaps melts or even volatilizes them. Hence dashing at once into the region of metaphysics, without so much as a thought that he is doing so, he begins to speak of an unknown, unseen, intangible something which he calls *heat*, and ascribes to it the phenomena which he has actually seen produced by heated objects, one by one, upon others less heated than themselves. In the same way he extemporizes the other six incorporeal causes or forces. We believe there are just six more, seven in all—heat, light, electricity, magnetism, affinity, cohesion and gravity. And as the old Hebrew and Christian writers spoke of God as the cause of all things, the modern man of science speaks of these as the causes or forces that produce them. St. Paul doubtless wrote the Epistle to the Romans, and yet Tertius was doubtless right, also, when he said or wrote "I Tertius wrote it."

Now unquestionably Science and Revelation are both right as truly and as really as both St. Paul and Tertius, when they both claim to have written the Epistle to the Romans. For, waiving the question for the present, regarding the reality of light, heat, etc., as forces or causes—they are one in nature, and in every event and phenomenon occurring there or elsewhere, two causes to each of them. In nature no event, fact, phenomenon or change occurs without—first, an efficient cause that produced it; and secondly, an occasional cause that put that efficient cause into a state of activity; and in moral or human action no act takes place without the efficient cause, which is the agent himself, and a final cause of motion. As an example of the former, take the case of the explosion of gunpowder. The nitrogen in the composition was doubtless the efficient cause, but a spark falling upon the powder was the occasional cause, and both and each of these alike are spoken of in the common use of language as "*the* cause," as if there were but one, and *it* were the only one.

We often represent this matter—the difference between the Scripture and the scientific representations of the phenomena of nature, under a simile or allegory of this kind. Two persons approach a large manufacturing establishment, such as is found only in modern times, but may be found almost anywhere in the modern civilized world; there it stands an imposing structure; its walls conceal all within from the view of outside observers. The one approaches; he sees around the doors manufactured articles of

most curious structure and admirable use. He sees at one end the immense column of water running into the mill or under its basement, it makes a tremendous noise, it comes out at the side or other end of the mill in great agitation, with great rapidity—all covered with froth and foam; and he goes away impressed with the idea that the *water* has done all this wonderful work of manufacturing. And as he enjoys the benefits of the change he feels grateful to the running water, warms not only with gratitude but with exciting imagery and poetic diction, and he sings its praise in "lofty verse." The other, and of course he must be a modern *savan*, with keen eye and skeptic inquisitiveness, approaches. He *enters* the establishment, does not even stop to see that water runs into the mill under it, or out of it at all. But he sees the wonders of machinery, for he is inside of the mill; shafts rolling, bands running, wheels, large and small, revolving; some slowly and with tremendous power, others rapidly and with as tremendous celerity; and right out from the midst of all this noise and motion come the manufactured articles. His eye sees the whole process from beginning to end; he even calculates the velocity and force of every wheel, pully-band, tooth or cog; nay he can go out and make a drawing of every machine and every part of it. He can explain to you the principle of every operation and transformation; he can tell exactly how everything was done, and how the result would have varied if the processes or the machinery had been at all different. Does not he know it all? Who shall dispute his word? And yet he tells you that MACHINERY has done for us all these wonders of manufacture. Well, who shall say that it has not? But did not the WATER have something to do with it, as our first, though unskeptical and perhaps unscientific friend supposed and reported? Are they not both right? Did not St. Paul and Tertius both write the Epistle to the Romans? The modern man of science knows perfectly well that shafts, wheels, pulleys and bands will not roll and move without a force to propel them. But he knows also that it makes no difference so far as his *science* is concerned, whether that force be man or beast, steam, wind, or running water. The ancient inspired writer knew nothing of shafts, wheels and bands. He had never seen into the mill; had scarcely so much as suspected that there was any machinery at all in it. He had no idea of a Tertius, who wrote the Epistle to the

Romans. The modern man of science has been so much engrossed and occupied with Tertius, that he has forgotten that there is or ever was a Paul who could be said in any sense to have written it. Now we think that there was both a Paul and a Tertius, and that Tertius was a very insignificant person, indeed, compared with St. Paul.

Or again, Suppose a thunder shower has occurred. Our man of modern science knows all about it. He tells us of heat as expanding the particles of water and causing evaporation from land and water. The particles of water thus released from cohesion are absorbed in the air, ascend and are carried with it whithersoever the current of the winds may blow. When this portion of air, by its motion comes into contact with a colder current or is in any way reduced in temperature; its capacity to retain moisture is reduced and the particles of water being brought under the influence of cohesion again, are formed into drops, and their gravity brings them in the form of rain to the earth. But in these processes electricity is excited, and the electric state of different masses of wind or of cloud and the earth, becomes such that the electricity in attempting to pass from one to the other, meeting resistance, an explosion takes place and a spark or flash of lightning is the result. The sound being echoed and re-echoed from cloud to hill gives the prolonged and rumbling sound so often heard as thunder. Surely Tertius wrote the Epistle to the Romans; nothing is clearer or more certain; there was no Paul. The phenomena do not imply one; they are easily understood and explained without: it is but the sheerest folly and superstition to suppose there ever was such a person.

But the eminent prophet, knew nothing of all this. With him Paul was the only person thought of. God made the thunder. God sent the rain. He knew nothing of heat and cohesion, and gravity, and electricity. He had never heard of Tertius, did not know that there was such a person, and did not much care whether there was or not. Paul was enough for him.

Now to scientific men and on purely scientific grounds, we can show that, if they stop at objects in nature or with the invisible forces already spoken of, as heat, light, &c., their explanation of the phenomena of Nature—and so their Science—is not complete or satisfactory. We may start with any phenomenon—the

result will be the same. Let it be the birth of a human child: the event implies two parents existing before the child, in a state of physical maturity. This event is therefore one in a series—and the law of that series the law of birth and parentage—is offspring from two parents and of the same species as the parents. To this there is no known exception: no departure from that law has ever been observed to take place—nor would any birth however abnormal or monstrous be recognized as a departure. Human offspring from human parents, apples from apple trees, peaches from peach trees, pears from pear trees, thus, and not otherwise does the law of reproduction take place. Within the species new varieties may arise, and varieties may vary still more and more widely: but they never do—they never have in the observation of man in any one simple instance, passed over the bounds that limit and distinguish the species so as to become another species. Never apples on pear trees, or peaches on apple trees—never human offspring from any other than human parents.

But there was a time when there were no human parents—when there was for the first time on this earth a human being—this and all that I have said above, all men of science admit. Now how came this first *human* being? Not by and in accordance with the law of the series; since there were no *human* parents from whom he could have been born. Suppose he was *immediately* created from the dust of the earth; then the act of creation implies a Creator and cannot take place without. Or was the first human being born of *un*human—not to say *in*human—parents. To say nothing of the physical difficulties, here is a phenomenon *supposed* for the occasion the like of which confessedly has never been seen or known to occur; one therefore contrary to all experience and all the observed and known laws of the universe: and the fact itself implies a cause or agent outside of mere physical nature as much and as truly as the creation of such an one immediately and out of the dust of the earth would imply a Creator. The first term of a series is never produced by any preceding term of the series, nor in accordance with the law of the series. Such a supposition would imply and could easily be reduced to a contradiction in terms. The theory of development or derivation, therefore, does not get rid of the necessity of supposing something more than the mere visible material objects, and the

invisible forces of nature as a means of accounting for the phenomena of nature.

But suppose we waive that difficulty. We gain nothing and lose nothing so far as the exigency of the argument is concerned, for in the course of our retrocession into the geologic ages we soon come to a time when there was no parentage of any kind. No living things of any order or species to be the parents of another. How then came the first living thing into existence? Not by parentage, for there were then no parents. Without parentage? then by a new law and a new agent working by that law. Or suppose we go back of the existence of any living or organic things to the beginning of motion and change. We encounter the same problem. Matter is inert, both mechanically and chemically. If we see a mass starting from rest to motion or changing the direction or velocity of its motion we know that there is a force not its own, not of itself, acting upon it. If we see two substances in contact but not acting upon each other, begin to act, we know that there has been a third substance in some way brought to act upon them. And the first substance or force that thus begins to act cannot have been inert or material. For then, He cannot have had somebody or something as an occasional or second cause to act upon Him. Shafts, and wheels, and pulleys will not turn and revolve without a propelling power that acts upon them. Machinery will not run without a moving force. Hence Revelation is right in speaking of a Mover or First Cause.

And so undoubtedly Science is right in speaking of physical causes in nature. So far as Science can know or her methods ascertain, God does not act without means or instruments. Just as in the human body the soul moves the feet, the hands, &c., and accomplishes all that of which it, in any sense is the efficient cause and moving agent, by means of bones, muscles and veins, and never accomplishes anything without, so in the physical universe God acts somewhere, *upon* matter and then through all the multiplied forms of material phenomena, by *means* of material instruments. But as with the soul so with the Author of the Universe, He must act somewhere directly on matter.

Take an illustration. Suppose the hand of a person in connection with the conducting wire of an electric machine, and the connection properly made, and the machine in motion. A current

passes up the sensory fibres of the arm to the spinal cord and is thence reflected back down the motor fibres to the muscles of the arm, and an apparent motion takes place, and this motion is involuntary and irresistible. Its cause —that is instrumental or secondary cause—was the electrical machine. Its first or primary cause was the *person* who set the machine in motion; for except as the machine is in motion no such effort will ensue. And the man must be a being capable of voluntary action. No matter what amount of machinery may have intervened between this person and the machine itself—no matter if even an animal had been attached to it, and trained to turn it, yet we come inevitably in the last analysis to a human agent—a person, at least acting *voluntarily and spontaneously* as the first cause of the electric shock and the contraction of the muscles which produced the motion in the arm of the subject. Now without any such machine, we can *voluntarily* produce a similar motion in the muscles of the arm. Who or what is now the first cause of the motion? We know, as matter of science, that (as before) our motion comes from the spinal cord down the motor nerve of the arm. We know also that this motion had its origin in the hemisphere of the brain, and passed from thence down the spinal cord to the origin of the nerves of the arm between the shoulders. But the brain itself: who or what set that in motion or put it in action? It is material: it obeys or acts under the law of inertia, like all other merely material substances. It can act only as it is acted upon; it can move only as it is moved. It is only a second cause, never is, and never can be, from its very nature a first cause. It no more accounts for the motions in the arm without something not material acting upon it, than the electric machine accounts for the similar motion in the arm without somebody setting the machine in motion. And this something that acts *on* the brain and *by means of* the brain must act under the law of spontaneity and not under that of inertia; it must therefore be emotional, personal, capable of thought and volition and final cause or purpose.

So in the material universe. No matter how many intervening second causes or means there may be, we come at last and by inevitable necessity, to something that is before second causes, inert means, one which is not inert—which is spontaneous—possessed

of intelligence, will and moral nature: for that is implied in purpose and final cause. At this personal something—we say, we arrive at last from any fact or phenomena in nature that we may choose to take for our starting point. As in mathematical series if it be an arithmetical series with a common difference of two, and any given term, that we may happen to light upon be an *odd* number, we know that the first term could not have been an *even* number. We need not know how many terms there may have been; we need not know what the first term was, where it was, or when it was; we know from the two facts, namely, that the present term is odd, and that the common difference is two or any other *even* number, that the first term must have been one odd number also. Or, again, if we have a geometrical series, no matter what the ratio, no matter what the first term, no matter what the given term, we know that there was a first term and that that term could not have been a Zero. So in nature. No matter how many intermediate second causes, instruments or means; we come at last to the first cause, which from the nature of the series must have been Something—not a Zero (for then there could have been no subsequent terms in the series,) and that this first cause or something could not have been inert, for then it could not have been a first term in any such series. It was in its nature First, Spontaneous, Personal, Spiritual: for whatever is first, spontaneous and personal, is spiritual, and whatever is first must be spontaneous or it could not be first, and whatever is spontaneous is personal.

And this First Cause in the Universe, like the soul of man in his brain, must act directly and immediately on matter. But how we know not, and probably never shall know. The fact we cannot deny; the mode we cannot explain. In the human body it seems to be a pretty well established fact in psychology, that the soul never acts immediately except upon the brain itself, and that all its other action is immediate, and by means of nerves, muscles, &c. It would seem however in the universe that God's action must be immediate on each piece and kind of matter. Take for example the simple fact of the falling of an apple, when the stem that connected it with the parent tree had been severed. The men of modern Science—the believers in a Tertius without a Paul—say, sometimes, that gravity brings it down or again, without obstruc-

tion, that the earth brings it down. But how comes the earth to attract the apple or to be an attracting body at all? How came Tertius to write if there is no Paul to dictate? On any theory of the material universe which the present state of physical Science with regard to objects that make up that universe will allow us to entertain or soberly mention for a moment, there was a time when this earth did not exist as an attracting mass at all,—nay a time when the particles of matter even if they were in existence, did not attract each other or cohere at all. How then came the first *active* state of those particles? Who made them to combine chemically, to cohere and to gravitate? And who makes them now to unite, cohere and gravitate, whenever union, cohesion or gravity take place? We can conceive them to exist without such activity. We know that they did once exist without it. If they act themselves now, it is not, *suâ sponte*, spontaneously—but as second causes, and under the law of inertia. But whose is the power by which they act? Not of course their own, innately and intrinsically—for then they would always have had it; and there could have been no time when they did not act. Primarily therefore the power is not their own. It is derived; it was given to them: it may be suspended, annulled or taken from them.

One thought more as to the difference between spontaneous and inert bodies or causes. A body acting under the law of inertia acts constantly and with the same force. Thus the earth attracts the moon with the same force and cannot change it to make it more or less to meet emergencies, move more or less at another time. But with any spontaneous being it is not so. We for example take hold of any thing to lift it; if it is light we put forth but little force: if it is heavy we put to the more strength until it rises, provided it is not so heavy that we cannot lift it. And when our object has been accomplished we cease to lift or make effort of that kind altogether. And this is action under the law of spontaneity. It is what spiritual personal beings do and what distinguishes them from mere inert matter. No mere material body can do so. If it coheres or attracts it does so with a force that is unceasing, unvarying—except as the force may, in certain cases, be made to vary or cease by something external acting upon it. And if in the whole universe there was a single particle of matter that was not inert and did not act under this law, then

Science itself would be at an end, for there could be no certainty, no uniformity in the phenomena of motion any more than there now is in the acts of the most incomprehensible and wayward of human beings.

We have then the result. God and human beings are spontaneous: matter and all material things are inert,—the powers they have or that are ascribed to them, are not their own. If they unite, cohere, gravitate, &c., &c., and in their processes, evolve (as the expression is) heat, light, electricity, &c.,—it is all of God and the powers that God has given them. And whether He acts personally in every moment and instance of attraction, cohesion, &c.; or whether He has given them the power to act—made them active under the law of inertia—we do not know. Nor is it necessary for any purpose that we have in view, that we should know. One theory is as good for our purpose as the other: though it seems most congenial to our present mode of thought to suppose that they act themselves as inert masses. But even so; we cannot get rid of the idea of His constant, indwelling, sustaining, creative power; in each and any one of them that they may exist, cohere, attract, &c.

And now what are the means or second causes by which He acts? Are they the imponderable forces and agents, heat, light, &c.? or are they the material masses themselves? So far as our present argument is carried it can make no difference. For if heat, for example, is a cause or an agent at all, it must be either spontaneous or inert. The words are contradictions—there can be no *tertium quid* between them. If heat or any of the imponderable forces or agents, be a force or agent at all and is spontaneous then it is God,—not matter or material at all—but spirit, First Cause, Personal Agent—God Himself, the Propelling Power that moves the machinery in the mill, the Paul that dictates to Tertius. If it be not all this, and yet be an agent or force, it is matter and so inert; as means or second cause only implies a spiritual Person, who uses it as a means or second cause. And of course the same may be said of light, electricity, magnetism, affinity, cohesion and gravity.

But the mischief of the thing is that mere physicists think by speaking of these forces as immaterial to escape the conclusion that there is a God whose presence or agency is implied in the

phenomena of the material world. Of course the properties of mere inert unthinking matter are not sufficient to explain the visible phenomena of material things. Hence the imponderable agents are called in as convenient somethings,—nobody knows or can exactly tell what—that are not matter nor yet God, and of which we may for the purposes of speculation make any thing that we please so as to account for the phenomena of nature without implying the existence of a Personal Creator or Moral Governor of the Universe. "Make what you will of Tertius, we will have no Paul to dictate dogmas to us—domineer over our opinions, control our actions and keep us in fear all our lives long of a final judgment and a life to come—any thing but that."

It is worthy of special note the prominence and emphasis that these physical writers of modern science give to their statements of our ignorance of the nature of force. Many of them even write and print the word with a capital letter—Force—as if that word were more acceptable to them than that other word which Jews would not pronounce; which all modern believers pronounce with reverence, and all Christians with love and inexpressible delight—God—so constantly, repeatedly, emphatically do they affirm that we do not know what force or Force is. Well then, if we do not know *what* force is, how do we know *that* it is at all? "Oh, but it produces effects." Very well. But if we *know* so much about it we know no more than that. Does it produce its effects under the law of inertia, regularly, uniformly, and in accordance with unvarying law? Or does it produce them as human beings do spontaneously and with something of irregularity, uncertainty and caprice? One or the other is inevitable. There is no third way; and if you *know*, actually know, that it produces effects at all, you must know in which of these two ways it produces them; and in knowing that you know enough to enable you to decide whether force be matter or God, a created *thing*, or a creating *Person*. We cannot allow you to explain the phenomena of the material universe by mere creatures of your own fancy, figments that you can even make to be one thing, and then another, as may best suit *your* purpose, without giving us some means to judge of them ourselves, and seeing whether they exist or not. The world is too much in earnest to allow of such trifling in her high places. The heart of man is too impatient to be put off with any such trickery. The

anxious conscience is too restless under its burden of guilt and fear to be contented with only such assurance as your ever heartless "*Unknowable*" can afford. Tertius don't satisfy us. The heart and conscience cry out, most impatiently cry out, for Paul—the inspired, the correct, the sympathizing Paul. We do not believe in machinery that runs without an impelling force. Neither do you. We believe in the Force and the machinery; you believe in the Machinery and the force. We are not enemies. We do not contradict each other. Cannot we be friends and agree? We must come to argument. The onward course of thought will compel us to it. You must acknowledge that machinery cannot run without force; and we shall be brought to confess that force can do nothing without machinery. You cannot believe in a world without a God, though you may even pretend to do so; and even this pretence cannot be kept much longer. It ought not for the cause of humanity and the comfort of your own hearts to be kept up any longer. Believe, confess, love and adore, and your science itself becomes divine, a revelation of God Himself. We do not believe in a God without a world; nor shall we, or can we, if we would, continue much longer to believe that He works in this world and in the ordinary course of affairs, except by means and instrumentalities and in conformity with laws, and that is Science.

And this brings us to the third point in our Essay. It is the most practical, and yet the most difficult point of all. It is that we must recognize and acknowledge the attainments of science. In our theology, in our preaching and our teaching, we must recognize the world and all the objects in it, as God's agent and instrumentality, with which He works and without which we have no right to expect Him to work. We may pray for rain, but we must not now expect or *trust* that He will send it except through the known processes and agencies of heat, evaporation, condensation, cohesive gravity, etc. We may pray for health and wealth, but we must not expect or *trust* that He will send either except as we conform to and obey the laws of health and the acquisition of wealth. We may hope and pray for the conversion of the heathen, but we must work also, and not expect their conversion without the use of ordinary means, with ordinary discouragements and delays; for "in Him we live and move and have our being."

All this is easily believed and readily assented to in general.

But we are too apt to forget in practice, and then deny it by implication. It is the constant habit which the men of science have of speaking of natural things as if there were no God, that alienates us from them, and makes us distrustful of them and of science. And it is our constant habit of speaking of God as if He worked without means in the phenomena of nature, and in accordance to its laws, that makes them distrust, and look upon us as shallow babblers, canting hypocrites, or designing impostors.

That the whole tendency of scientific education in our day is against us we cannot deny; the great mass of the scientific men are slipping away from our influence, losing their confidence in the Church and in revealed Theology. The whole tendency and current of thought is setting in that direction. It would be easy to accumulate statistics to confirm this assertion. But the fact is too obvious to need this kind of confirmation. Now we can arrest this current, and regain them back only by recognizing the facts and laws of science. We cannot do it by denying their facts and denouncing their persons. We cannot do it by teaching that religion is essentially, totally distinct from science, and that without being contradictory they are at best only supplementing the one or the other; so that a man may attend to his religion and do up his piety on Sundays, and attend to science through the week.

To illustrate what we mean, we quote a passage from that most charming little book, "The Little Episcopalian:"

"But mother, what is the reason I am not so strong as Bessie?"

* * * * * * *

"Because, my dear, God did not make you so. He did not give you as vigorous a constitution as He gave your sister."

"And why *didn't* He, mother? Why did not God make us both strong and well?"

"Ah, my child! your mother cannot tell you that. But this I can tell you, Jennie: God has some wise and good reason for making you a frail, delicate little girl."

Now we would not have this answer different *under the circumstances.* It was true, and it was all the truth that the circumstances required or would well permit of being uttered at the time. But did the mother believe that it was all of the truth? all that she as a mother ought to have known? Such teaching is wise and well to induce patient resignation under evils that we cannot help

, and to prompt us to make the best of unfavorable circum-
over which we have no control. But he or she that takes
er view takes only a half view, and often the other half that
out of sight and out of thought is that which most of all
have been noted. Suppose the mother had said in this
'You are indeed weakly and feeble, my darling child, and
y fault. God is good and loving to all His creatures. I
your constitution by my own folly and dissipation; my own
and disobedience of God's laws, when you were too young
w anything or do anything that could displease Him. And
e is so merciful and good that He will give you patience
signation, an abiding sense of His goodness and love, that
ake you happier even under your misfortune than your sister
, or will be without." We do not know what the mother's
ay have been, or what the father's. But we do know, and
science demands what we admit, that there was some dis-
of the laws of health that caused the feebleness of their
ng. They may have been ignorant of those laws; they may
een so situated that the fulfillment of them was impossible.
en parents continue habits of dissipation, idleness and vice,
ulgence in angry passions before the birth of their children,
ave no right to blame God for the feebleness of their con-
ons. If parents who are scrofulous, consumptive, insane,
y constitution and by hereditary descent, or will marry in-
usly, they ought to know that God, good as He is, works by
, and not without means; and He is no more responsible for
ulty, deformity or idiocy of their children, than He is for
plosion by which the assassin sends the fatal bullet through
art of his victim.

ow we would gain the confidence of scientific men and win
ack to Revelation and to Religion, we must *accept science
r theology and make it a part of it.* We must acknowledge
rtius wrote the Epistle; for the Epistle itself expressly says
e would have the men of science respect our opinions and
to our teachings when we say that Paul wrote it.

btless there are times when, as we have said, we should say
God sends our sickness"—and that is all that we need to
. that the occasion demands at such times. But it is not all
e need to know. It is not all that we must acknowledge

in regard to it some time, and there are occasions when we must say that the sickness has come from our own fault or folly. Justice to God requires that we shall acknowledge this. Fidelity to ourselves requires that we should acknowledge it. Fairness to the men of science requires that we should confess that so much of what they teach is true.

And so in every department of applied Theology. We go among the poor. It is well to tell them that idleness and prodigality will cause poverty, and in so far as their poverty and distress have come from these faults of their own, they have nobody to blame but themselves. And on the other hand it is just as well to tell the rich that industry, frugality and economy, are sure means to wealth. But we must not tell them that the possession of wealth always implies that they have practiced those virtues, or that it in any way implies some mysterious and unknown cause of God's special favor to them. For we *know* that fraud and oppression often produce wealth and station and power; and that the poor and down-trodden are not always in that miserable condition, because God had forsaken them, or because they are sinners above all others of their fellow-men. God can indeed comfort and relieve them in their poverty; but He has not brought it upon them except by their own idleness and improvidence, and not at all therefore, unless they have been idle and improvident. If by the financial and commercial policy of the government that is over them they have been brought into a condition where they must labor for a few pennies a day, while others who lord it over them produce nothing and live in affluence and splendor, we don't think we do the cause of Science or of Revelation much good service when we speak to them or their oppressors of their condition as being an allotment of Providence. Neither they nor their oppressors are likely to have much respect for a "Providence" that can perform such exploits among men. Juggle the matter as we will, cover it with sophistry as we please; it is not God's doings when the industrious poor cannot by their labor earn enough for the purposes of comfortable, honest, virtuous living, while there are unindustrious idlers, who manage, somehow or another, to get out of the earnings of the laborer enough to live in affluence and splendor.

No; we must take science into theology, if we would save theology

itself from utter neglect, and scientific men from utter unbelief and rejection of Revelation altogether. Whatever fact, or principle, or law, science has attained or may attain, is so much added to our knowledge of the will and purposes of God, the way in which He does things, the way in which we should act to obey His will, keep His laws and secure His favor and the rewards of His moral government. Every fact discovered, every principle ascertained, is a revelation in the department of Theology itself; it is by so much a disclosure of a mystery that has hitherto been hid from our knowledge; it is so much added to that that we already know, to make us wiser unto salvation. There is no conflict between Science and Revelation; the one explains the other, and each, as the past has undoubtedly shown, is unintelligible without the other; and the more we know of Science the better we shall understand Revelation itself. Let us be friends, we theologians and scientists. When I say God has sent me this disease, and he says I brought it upon myself by my intemperance, or over exertion, by the use of tobacco, or by both study and insufficient exercise, don't let us fall to contradicting, disputing, calling hard names, and denouncing each other as bigots, imbeciles, etc., etc., but rather let us each say "you are right, brother," the whole truth is "God did send it upon me by means of my own vices and faults."

And let us amend our teaching and our preaching accordingly. We think that scientific men will not be slow or reluctant to acknowledge our theology, if we will accept their science. They—that is all of them that are fair-minded and candid, and most of them are really such—are not unwilling to acknowledge the existence of God, if we will acknowledge that *He*—namely the God we believe in—works in the ways and by the means that they in their investigations have found that *somebody* works in. And if this acknowledgment shall be found to require some modification of our theology, do not let us be alarmed. Theology is *of men*, truth is *of God*, and Revelation but not theology, is from God. All systems of Divinity are hence made for ourselves; honestly and faithfully made, no doubt. But the day for believing in human infallibility has gone by. Unquestionably every Christian believes in the fourteenth, and in all preceding centuries believed and would have deemed as an article of truth, if not as an article of "the Faith:" 1st. That the Bible did teach something concerning

the motions of the earth, and the heavenly bodies, and the age of the earth; and 2d, that that something was that the earth was stationary, and had been created only about six thousand years. And yet they were all wrong. Let us learn that Science may yet correct our Theology in still other points. Truth it cannot correct. Revelation it cannot correct, for Revelation cannot be wrong, though we may be wrong in our interpretation of the words of Revelation, and the design and purpose of Him who spoke to us by Prophets, and in the latter days by His Son.

God and Nature are in harmony. He is the author of Nature, and Nature is His creation. He works through and by means of Nature. Nature does and can do nothing without Him. And He does not, except in miracles, work except through Nature. But we believe in miracles. Miracles have been wrought. One was wrought when, on this earth inorganic matter first took on the form of organic life, and became a living thing. Another was wrought whenever and on each occasion where there appeared the first individual or the first pair of any new distinct species in the organic world, whether of plants or animals. No theory of development or derivation can escape this result. They can at most vary the form in which the miracle occurred, but none of them can explain away the miraculous nature of the event. And we believe, too, that each of the great epochs in the religious history of men, the covenant of Abraham, the Mosaic polity and the Christian Dispensation has been ushered in and attested by miracles. But we doubt if since the introduction of Christianity miracles have been wrought. And we expect no more hereafter. Hence whatever God does now He does in a *natural* way; in the way of nature, the way of law, of cause and effect, the way of means and instrumentalities, the way of uniformity and regularity, so that men may learn His ways from the facts of nature in the pursuits of science as well as in the study of the Bible; and learn from the study of both how to regulate their actions, what to expect from the use of means, and what to dread from a violation of God's laws, that in short they may act as intelligent, moral beings in the exercise of will and choice, forming for themselves characters and growing up by these means and God's grace, assisting them into the nature of the fullness of Christ.

We have no right to expect and cannot righteously have, any-

thing that we do not obtain by the use of the means God has appointed for such ends. Those means are two; work and prayer—the Bible, Revelation, Theology teach about prayer—Science teaches about labor—the means to use, the way to use them, the effects they will produce, the mistakes to be avoided, the dogmas to be guarded against. Both are needful; Science and Theology—both are helpful—they are twin sisters and necessary to each other.

What prayer can do for us Science can never tell. That it has a powerful subjective effect we know. He that prays sincerely and earnestly is always the better for his praying. The Bible teaches also that it has an objective effect; it helps us to that which we righteously ask for. Science will of course be skeptical about any effect of prayer except that produced upon our own hearts. But it can never prove that there are no other; and believers, those who have believing hearts, will always probably believe that there is, (we are no prophets and do not much believe in uninspired prophecy, therefore we say probably), they will always think that God in answer to prayer disposes the order of events in the outward world somewhat in regard to the welfare of His people. And as we have said, Science cannot prove that He does not. It cannot deny His existence. It cannot deprive Him of personality. And personality consists in doing voluntary, optional things. But He is a righteous Governor; and the righteousness of government consists in its being according to law. The laws of nature are the common understanding between God and His creatures, a part of the contract and covenant between Him and them, whereby they may know what to do and what to expect. A departure from them to favor our view, would be a damage to many others and an injustice to all. Here we must expect no miracles—no departures from general laws. But we do not know and never can know the laws of nature well enough to say that there can be no personal favor, no loving-kindness, no fatherly hand in the administration of those laws, favoring the righteous and "tempering the wind to the shorn lamb." We can never sufficiently comprehend the possibilities—limitations there are none—of the wisdom and omnipotence of God, to say that He cannot do anything that is in itself possible and righteous.

But Science, and Science alone can teach us what work is and how it is to be performed. And both Science and Revelation concur in teaching that without work prayer is unavailing—"Knowledge is power," and science gives us knowledge. And we do not limit the word science in this connection to any of its narrower significations. We use the word to signify and include all that man can *know*. It includes all that does not rest on mere *faith*. It includes the common sense notion that all have and acquire by observation and experience no less than the constant deductions of a most abstruse investigation. It includes History and Political Economy as well as Physiology and Chemistry. It includes whatever we can learn or know of God's works and ways, without Revelation and by the unaided exercise of our own natural faculties.

And in the recognition which we are thus to give to science, we are, of course, to limit ourselves to those facts and laws that are ascertained beyond further question or doubt among the students of the sciences themselves. We are to recognize, as we do, the fact that the earth is a revolving globe—that it has existed in one form or another for a period indeterminately long. Whether we shall at once and now admit the great antiquity of man, as an inhabitant of the earth may be a matter of doubt. We believe that *all* the students of physical science, and especially those who are acknowledged as professionals in geology, are agreed on this point, and if so, it is only a question of time when and how soon other persons will come to acknowledge it. And if we hold back *unreasonably*, we do, by inevitable consequence, just so much estrange the confidence of scientific men, alienate their affections and lose all hold upon them for good. With regard to the other great and exciting theory of the day, Development, and the derivation of higher species from lower without any Divine interposition—any miraculous interference of God in the works of creation, most assuredly we are not called upon to accept it. For it is still in dispute and is opposed by some of the greatest names in the ranks of modern science. Even its advocates admit that there is a gap in the evidence, a want of facts to confirm or sustain one of its most fundamental assumptions. The advocates of the theory offer it only as a way in which the origin of species *may have occurred*, and adduce certain facts to show (what no one can doubt) that

there are certain tendencies and influences in that direction. But they do not claim that any actual case of transmutation or derivation like what they suppose, has ever occurred under the observation or within the knowledge of man. The whole tenor and current of experience without an exception is the other way. And it seems to us, regarding the matter purely from the stand-point of the history of the progress of the Inductive Sciences, that we must judge that any theory occupying the position that those of development and derivation do, will never be established or reckoned among the truths of Science, but will, on the contrary, be consigned to the receptacle of the wild speculations of those who allow their fancy to outrun the dictates of reason. This we say we merely judge from the general aspect of the case without regard to the special condition of the arguments for or against the theories.

With regard to all such theories our attitude and our strength undoubtedly is "to stand still" and "in patience possess our souls." Doubtless the spectacle is exciting: doubtless grave interests are at stake, the faith of many will be undermined and souls will be ruined by the promulgation of such theories. But has not the experience of the past three centuries taught us that our interposition is unavailing? No warning that we can give—no denunciation that we can utter—no argument that we, as theologians, can urge will have the slightest tendency to arrest the evil. We may, in our private capacity,—by gentleness and meekness exert a salutary and, by God's blessing, a saving influence upon here and there one and another who are doubting or in danger. But no public attitude of ours, but the calm dignified silence of reserve, can do any good. And this *will* do good; for it will show our faith and trust in God: it will show more than that, it will show our candor and our willingness to admit that there may yet be truths and phases of truth that we have not taken into consideration, and that we are willing to accept them whenever we shall see that they are proved to be truths. But these scientific men will fight the battle out among themselves, without our aid and little regarding what we may say, whether of hope or of fear. If the thing proposed be truth, it is of God and we cannot resist or overthrow it; if not it will come to nought of itself. Scientific men are too ambitious, too jealous of each other to allow the mere opinions and suggestions of any one man or party to be accepted as true so long as, in the strength of argu-

ments and facts, they can prevent it. Doubtless, these controversies promote infidelity, and infidelity is a great evil, ruining souls for time and for eternity. But for every soul that infidelity has ruined we may say in the face of facts and of history, more than one has been ruined by superstition and bigotry. Whom did our Lord denounce most severely, the unbelieving, infidel Sadducees, or the superstitious, bigoted Scribes and Pharisees? To which of these classes did He say, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures?" and to which "Ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" No, God waits and is patient: we can afford to do so too. And whatever may be the fact in the case, we can avoid giving the impression that we are impatient, and if impatient we are, it comes from an unwillingness to have the foundations of our position scrutinized—a suspicion perhaps not even confessed to ourselves, that some of our dogmas will not abide the test of truth.

Recall the age and history of Galileo. The theologians of that age with great unanimity thought him wrong. They thought him a heretic, an enemy to Christianity, undermining the faith, and as a consequence they not only denounced him, but even compelled him to denounce himself. But who in the judgment of this age, and of all ages to come, is, and is to be considered the most heretical, the worst enemy of the truth and of Christianity—most tending to undermine the faith and ruin souls, the doomed and denounced Galileo, or the dooming and denouncing Church that assumed jurisdiction over him and his opinions in matters of science? Let us learn from history; let us grow wise by experience.

The facts of Science which we have occasion to take note of are of two classes. 1st. Those like the ones we have just been considering, which require when they are established and accepted as true, some change in our theology, some change from the commonly received interpretation of the Bible. And 2d. Those which merely serve to illustrate its ethical and practical teachings—the mode and way in which God works to accomplish what He has either promised or threatened—promised to the good and obedient and threatened to the wicked and disobedient. The former facts can only raise questions of interpretation; and the great question of this kind raised and pressed upon us now in this half century of the world's history, by the (claimed) discovery of the

great antiquity of man, is whether the writer of the first chapters in our Bible intended them to be historical or allegorical, history or parable—we might almost say fable or myth—designed not to set forth sober fact, but rather theological doctrine and exhortation to faith and piety. And as the former doctrines concerning the earth and its age, have been accepted without changing a single doctrine of our theology, of that we mean which we regard as fundamental and essential to the faith and to salvation, so they cannot see—and they have tried very hard and very faithfully and fearlessly to show—that the admission of the new doctrine of interpretation—will not in the slightest degree change our view of the great doctrines of Revelation concerning the Fall, and the Redemption of mankind—with whatever is necessarily implied in them.

The influence of the other class of facts is of a different character. They will not require any change in our doctrines or modes of interpretation. They will predispose us not to admit a miracle, when there is not the clearest evidence of a miracle having been wrought. But not even the establishment of the extremest view of Development and Derivation can take from the facts of Science "the testimony of the Rocks," written ineffaceably in the geological history of the earth, the proof of miraculous Divine interposition "at sundry times and in divers manners" in the past. But they will compel us to appeal to the Bible as a Book whose declarations we must accept though we cannot understand them, and see the reason of what it teaches, less, and to reason and common sense, more. They will lead us to see that although Christianity is in a most important sense, *supernatural*, yet that it is in no sense *un*natural, that it is on the contrary the most natural thing in the world—that common sense and good sense is the best part of Theology. And Christianity, as the result of Revelation, is but the exegesis of common sense, by means of inspiration, into the sphere which it could not penetrate of itself, and bringing within its grasp and comprehension facts and principles that it otherwise would not dream of. Not that they will remove or explain all mysteries. Mysteries always lie on the margin and outline, in the horizon of our knowledge, and especially in the dim horizon of our knowledge of things divine. Incomprehensible facts and principles there always will be. As fast as

one is cleared up and brought within the grasp of our intelligence another and still others will loom up in the distance. This must ever be the condition of all progressive being—with all but the Omniscient Himself.

These facts will dispose us, and *compel* us too, if we will gain the ear of our congregations and secure their attention at all, to say less of the Divine Agency as such, and after the old manner, and more of the means which *we* are to use and by which God works, than we have been accustomed to do. Not that the Divine Agency is to be denied or overlooked—and man come to trust in himself. Not that at all, but that what men will acknowledge as already sufficiently known, is the promise and aid of God, and that which for the present emergency they most want to hear about is duty. What they have to do. The means they are to use and the use they are to make of them. They will want to understand the machinery as well as the power that propels it. They will want and we must give them, or they will accept nothing from us, not what are called "doctrinal" sermons but "practical" ones. Doctrinal Sermons must be left for special days, as Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Whitsuntide and Trinity. And they will be welcome then if wisely written and reverently delivered.

Christianity when thus presented will be its own best evidence. It can need no other; for it will be seen to be just what the age needs, what the heart and wants of man demand. Make it this and men will not much care how much you claim for it a supernatural origin and a divine character. When they see that it is what they want, that it does not contradict common sense, stultify reason and taboo science,—is not claimed and preached as merely a thing that is by some mysterious way to save men's souls in another world, while leaving them in doubt whether they have souls to be saved, except as we say that they have, and doing little or nothing to save them from meanness, impurity and contempt in this world, they will accept it. When they see this, they will not care how much we extol its origin or whatever is excellent, exalting or soul-stirring we may say or claim in its favor. They will not care to discuss questions of miracles and theories of inspiration; for they will have made up their minds to accept, for its own excellency's sake, that which you so seek to support by these claims. They will not be intending to reject or wishing in any

way to get rid of it; and therefore they will not care how high we put its claims or how strongly we put our arguments in its favor. But it seems to us that he has but very imperfectly studied the past or comprehended the present, who has not read in "the signs of the times" the fact that the human race, or at least that part of it that we have to deal with, will not much longer consent to receive on any pretence of Divine authority or any promises of the bliss of heaven, or any threats of the pains of hell, a system that has no affinity or harmony with the deepest wants and the most earnest thoughts of the age. And these wants and thoughts, so far as the masses of mankind are concerned, are not so much how shall we be saved in the next world, as how can we and our fellowmen escape the hell of moral and social ruin in this world, into which we are so rapidly, so recklessly, so hopelessly plunging? 'Show us that Christianity, or *anything* else, can help us here in this our direst need, and we will accept it, asking no questions for conscience' sake. And if with this, you can show us that your system gives assurance of a future life and of a preparation for it, by that purification and elevation which is to raise us out of the slough of despond' in this, why so much the better. We are yours with all our heart. We and ours are at your disposal. Save us *in* this world, and *for* the next, and that is all we ask." But the mere preaching of theological dogmas will not do this. Ritualism cannot accomplish it. We must descend to first principles; teach line upon line, precept upon precept, the very a b c's of practical morality; the lines and paths and steps of duty, as God has written them in the laws and the very "constitution and course of nature," with a clear exhibition of the rewards of obedience, which are always secured in whatever is well undertaken, provided it is right and honest, and of good report, and the pains and penalties of disobedience, which are always in the line of failure—loss of the confidence and respect of our fellowmen, disease and pain and death *in this world.* And this we must exhibit as men see it, and in such a way that they can verify our teaching by an appeal to their own observation and experience, and say, "that is sensible," "that is God's truth!"

When, a few years ago, the Emperor of Russia was in France and riding through the Boulevards with the Emperor of France, an insane Pole attempted to assassinate the Russian Emperor. On

discovering how narrowly he had escaped, he exclaimed in the pious gratitude of his heart, "We are in the hands of Providence!" "Ah, yes," replied the Mephistophiles of France, "ah yes, and so are the hands of the assassin." We must be able to unravel the sophistry involved in this reply. If God works through the instrumentality of second causes and of natural objects and forces, we must take care that we do not make Him the author and worker of evil as well as good. But we must not in order to avoid such a result, represent Him as working miracles, or as using the objects and forces of nature in part, and when they tend to good, and a devil as using them also when they tend to or result in evil. Two men start on a train of cars, or on a steamer to cross the ocean. Shall we say that he that goes on a good errand or under the influence of pure and right motives, is less likely to meet with an accident, than the man who goes to cheat a friend, assassinate a rival, or betray helpless innocence into servitude and hopeless degradation? One of our earliest recollections is of a warning given us by a pious mother that we should not go to play on a neighboring pond *on Sunday*, because if we did we would surely be drowned. She even urged her warning by the citation of cases of accidents happening to those who were at the time engaged in Sabbath-breaking. The warning was well meant, but it was most unfortunate in its influence. We knew enough, or at least we thought we did, and acted accordingly, to know that accidents by drowning, etc., were no more likely to occur on Sunday than on any other day, other things being equal. God does not enforce positive institutions, or sanction *moral* principles in that way. He punishes transgression of physical laws with physical penalties. If one goes in an insecure boat he is in danger of capsize and drowning, Sunday or any other day alike. If one goes in cars or steamboat in disregard of the *physical* conditions of safety, he is in danger indeed; but the danger is the same whether he is a sinner or a saint; whether he is in pursuit of the basest object the heart of man can conceive, or of the purest and noblest that man can ever subserve. If however he commits a *moral* offence, the penalty is moral. If he tells a lie, betrays a trust, insults the weak and unoffending, he loses the confidence, the respect, the good will of mankind. He may become an outcast, be avoided and despised by all mankind. This is the way God punishes offences against

he moral law, not by capsizing sail-boats, smashing up cars and xploding boilers. Or again, if one breaks the Sabbath or commits any offence against the positive institutions of religion, he not only loses the good will of men to some extent, but he hardens his own heart, deprives himself of all the comforts of hope, all the strengthening influences of faith, all the blessings of a sense of God's goodness and favor. The skies may smile just the same, the rains will fall and the sun will shine, and his crops may grow, but in all these there is no goodness of God *for Him;* that light and blessed assurance are shut out of *his* heart. The ball of the assassin may be averted, but he sees nothing of Providence in it, nothing to be grateful for, nothing to assure him of continual favor, nothing that can take from his bosom the undying worm and the burning flame that gnaws and burns in the anxious distrust and painful forebodings of him who knows not God and does not acknowledge Him in all or any of his ways. He sees and can see no more of God in the ball averted than in the upraised hand of the assassin that propelled it. He sees and can see nothing to be grateful for in the good he enjoys, and he fears only evil in whatever the future may have to unfold.

But our Article is getting too long—we must draw it to a close. We must make our teaching accord with common sense, and acknowledge science as a part of common sense. We must acknowledge God in the works and phenomena of nature ascribed to Him, whatever of good accrues, and to men the ignorance, the inadvertence, the selfishness, whatever of evil may overtake us. There are but these two moral agents—first causes, *real* causes, that we know of or have any account with. We think that the day for the belief in an Ahriman or Evil Spirit, except as it exists in men is fast passing away, even if it has not already gone. Science knows nothing of it, furnishes no proof of its existence, cannot well admit the possibility of it. God has done what is good, men somehow have done what is evil. Some of the good, perhaps much may be man's, but none of the evil can be ascribed to God. When evil is done we do it, when we do evil we work by ourselves, and in our own strength. When we do good we work with God, and God works within us to do that which is well pleasing in His sight. God is in all truth, and in all righteousness. When we are speaking the truth we

are proclaiming His word; when we are acting right we are doing His work, and the success and rewards of Divine favor will be ours.

We trust none of our readers will suppose that we would have our Clergy go to preaching Science or Revelation of any kind, though possibly some of them might be benefited by studies of that kind. But their work is to preach the Gospel, Christ and Him crucified, and that only. But we would not have them preach as though they had lived five centuries ago, or knew nothing of what has occurred since that time; the Faith is of course the same unchanging through the ages. But the vices, the errors, the doubts and the wants that are to be met are various, and to some extent new in any age and peculiar to the age; and whatever the Faith may be the preaching to be effectual must be a ratio between the two, and thus exhibit the characteristics of both.

No one who believes in anything supernatural will object to this, and if one does not he cannot be accommodated by any effort we can make to explain the supernatural out of the Bible, or out of science. But the moment we undertake to preach the gospel or to explain its doctrines and precepts as though that which all scientific men in our age believe were not written or known, they lose confidence in us, and we lose our influence over them; they are even indifferent, skeptical, unbelieving, and perhaps irreconcilably hostile. But with these concessions in their favor, this token of respect to their convictions of what they know, we shall have disarmed prejudice, secured respect for our persons and our office, and be prepared to offer them what their science cannot afford, and what we cannot doubt they will, under such circumstances, be glad to receive.

Art. IV.—A PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD.

Questions of grave import, relating to doctrine and affecting directly the integrity of our present Book of Conmon Prayer, are likely to come before our General Convention at its next session. On the one hand there is the yet unsettled question of the Nicene Creed. As is well known to the readers of the Review, the last Convention was formally approached by no less than six Dioceses, and a number of other members of the Church, clerical and lay, who stated in their memorials that they could find in our Prayer Book no correct version of "the Nicene Creed," and asked the General Convention to set forth for them an accurate translation from the Greek of the Œcumenical Symbol, their design being to *use* this translation, where the rubric requires it, immediately after the Gospel in the Communion Service; unless the Apostles' or Nicene had been said immediately before in the Morning Prayer. It is true that at the very close of the Convention, it was voted (with the assent of all the friends of the movement) that action was "*inexpedient at this time.*" But the number and zeal of the memorialists is not likely to decrease with the lapse of time; especially since the remarkable pamphlets of Rev. Mr. Ffoulkes have attracted the attention of the general public to this very point, and have laid bare with a masterly hand the weakness of the *Filioque* clause.

But another and widely different movement is now on foot. Within a year past nine or ten of our Rt. Reverend Fathers have put their names to a paper, which declares that the consciences of many of their brethren are burdened by certain phrases in the Office for the Ministration of Baptism to Infants, and relief is asked by the adoption at least of alternate phrases in the Service. The extent of this movement, or the course which its friends will pursue in the event of defeat, we have as yet no means of judging. But this we know, that our next General Convention will be asked by a certain number of clergymen and laymen to alter the Baptismal Office, which has been used in all branches of the Anglican Church since the Reformation, and to cancel the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, either by expunging it altogether from our

formularies, or by making the Church teach and deny it in the same breath.

There is this fundamental difference to be noted between the Nicene and the Baptismal Memorialists. The first ask simply for a rectification of the Text of the Creed, not even its formal incorporation in the Prayer Book. This granted, they demand no further changes in the Liturgy, or Articles, or elsewhere; though they might not oppose them if broached by others. Their wishes denied, they make no threats of secession; nor is it probable that the utter failure of their plans would drive a single one of them out of the Anglican Communion. If the Church is to be controlled by fear rather than by love, their cause is therein the weaker.

But the dullest observer of "the signs of the times" must discern that the baptismal question is but "the beginning of the end." Baptismal Regeneration once abolished from our formularies, "Priest," "Altar," "Sacrifice," "Absolution," must follow in rapid succession, until every vestige of the "Sacramental System" shall have been abolished from the Prayer Book, and the Church reduced to the dogmatic level and ritual "Use" of Hanover, or Put-in-Bay. Whether this would be a "consummation devoutly to be wished," or the utter ruin of the Church, is not within the scope of the present Article to determine—we merely call attention to the fact. And besides all this, while the leaders of this movement are making these loud demands for such ceremonies, they are threatening schism in the Church. There is to be a great secession from our pale of the lovers of 'truth and purity,' a new and more glorious P. E. Church is to be founded with self-ordained Bishops, if no better material can be had; since the new Zion is to repudiate "Apostolical Succession," as one of the figments of Popery. If the friends of this movement are as numerous as they are loud spoken, the situation is a very grave one. We are asked to change the fundamental doctrine of the Church, or else to lose a certain number of our children; at the very moment, when laying aside all partisan feuds, the Church in America should be bending all her energies to the great work of converting and evangelizing our vast continent.

We hope not to be thought lacking in due respect to that venerable and august body, our General Convention, if we venture to suggest that these great questions are above its province. They

are in no sense American and local; they concern the whole Anglican Communion, if not the entire Holy Catholic Church. We must not act in such a way as to compromise our brethren abroad. No argument told with more force against the Nicene Memorialists in the last Convention than this,—that it would not do to recite the Creed one way in America and another way in England. We can assure our friends of the Baptismal movement that the argument will be pressed home to *them*, and they must own the justice of it themselves. The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is as precious or as odious to the English peer, or the converted Maori or Zulu, as it is to the American Churchman. If it is a "burden to the conscience" in our own country, it must be equally burdensome in Great Britain and South Africa and Australia. If it is a priceless heritage handed down to us from our fathers, Anglican Churchmen abroad cannot afford to let it be tampered with by rash American hands.

In an able and well written Pastoral by the Bishop of New York attention is drawn to the following fact, which the leaders of both movements would do well to ponder. It can hardly be gainsaid that the strong tendency in our American Communion is not toward diversity; but on the contrary toward greater uniformity with the Mother Church of England.

Immediately after the war of our Revolution the feeling of the country, even among Churchmen, was bitterly anti-English. The problem seemed to be, to depart as widely as possible from the offices of the Mother Church, without actually repudiating her Orders and Communion. Let any one who doubts this statement read carefully "The Proposed Book;" in which even the Nicene Creed was thrown overboard. Now, thank God! the current is setting strongly the other way. Unity is the watchword. The Lambeth Conference has been a powerful stimulus to this feeling. If "one member suffer, all the members suffer with it:" if one is honored, "all the members rejoice with it." Many intelligent and devout Churchmen are asking the questions, Why the *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis* should not be restored to their proper place in the evensong of the Church? And what objection is there to the insertion of the *Athanasian Hymn* in the body of the Prayer Book, provided its *use* in divine service were made obligatory on no one? We may ere long look for powerful movements in

this direction, *i. e.* to secure for ourselves all that is really valuable in the Liturgy and Offices of the Mother Church. In the face of this popular, and by no means unreasonable feeling, the Memorialists of both parties must approach the General Convention and make their demands. They claim it as a matter of conscience with them, and there is no reason why we should doubt their word.

What answer will the Convention make? Will it be a decided negative? In the case of the Creed, we can conceive of but one negative, which would preclude all further action. That is a solemn declaration that we now possess the original Œcumenical Symbol of the undisputed councils, free from all error and interpolation. Such a declaration (like the definition of Papal Infallibility) must be made in the face of all historic truth; and is hardly likely to proceed from such a body as our conscientious and truth-loving General Convention.

Will the answer to the Baptismal Revisionists be a decided negative? Permit us, as one not interested in their cause, to urge a doubt as to the wisdom of such a course. Let us not forget that there are many who both think and write that a little exercise of Christian policy and forbearance would have saved to the Church of England both Wesley and Newman with their disciples. Let us not repeat the mistake by any rash or ill-advised action! But shall their prayer be granted? *Μὴ γένοιτο.* What, make the Anglican Church a babbler? teaching one set of doctrines on one side of the Atlantic, and another on opposite shores! Is orthodoxy a thing of latitude and longitude, to be determined by the gulf stream? We can see no adequate remedy for the matter save in the words which stand at the head of this Article—*a Pan-Anglican Synod*—for the settlement of vexed questions.

When the South African Church felt the iron of heresy entering into her very soul, her cry was heard in England, and the result was the Lambeth Conference of 1867. There were those (especially the Erastians in England) who argued ill of the measure—its result was to be the ruin of the Church. Yet we see the result of that conference (restricted as was the sphere of its action) has been the strength, instead of the weakness of the Church.

We venture then in all humility, to suggest to the General Convention, that when these grave questions of fundamental doctrine shall come before it, it shall decline the decision of them; not as

ı timid evasion of consequences, but with a call for a general ynod or council of all Anglican Churches, to hear and to decide. That the response of the Archbishop to such a request from such ı source would be favorable, who can doubt? If he refused, the esponsibility of such a step would rest with him. The theatre of ction in these matters would then be transferred to the whole Anglican Church, where it properly belongs. We can speak with ome authority in the name of the Nicene memorialists, and say hat they would be most happy to submit their question to such a ribunal. If after a careful and deliberate hearing the decision hould be unfavorable to them, they could only (like Huss and Vyclyffe), appeal to some future true and lawful Œcumenical Council of the Church, when the day for Christendom's reunion hould arrive. But would the other party in like event submit? Ve should see by their action, whether they were loyal sons of the Church, or schismatics at heart. We are not in their counsels, nd cannot tell what their line of action would be. But if the inritable result of the agitation of this question be a schism, there ı no reason why our little Missionary Church in the United States hould bear the shock of division, alone and unaided by the Mother nd Sister Churches. When the local Church of Alexandria was exed by the clamor of Arius and his followers, all Christendom 'as summoned to the rescue; and it has ever been the fashion of he Church to appeal questions of general interest to the whole Body of Christ. Alas! that in these days of strife and division uch a council cannot assemble!

Let us attempt a hasty sketch of our idea of a Pan-Anglican ynod. It should be composed, of course, of the BISHOPS of the Church of Christ. In accordance with primitive usage, absent Bishops might depute two or more godly and learned presbyters of ıeir diocese to represent them as *legates*, and cast the vote of ıeir diocese in their behalf. A few laymen, learned in ecclesiascal and secular law, might be admitted as *assessors*, to give the enefit of their advice in legal and canonical matters. An assemly thus constituted would truly represent the entire Anglican hurch, and from its decisions there would be no appeal save to ı Œcumenical Council. Perhaps once in *ten* years would not be o often for its regular assemblage. Of course at present, its ecisions would not have the force of positive law; but the local

Churches could provide for the acceptance of its authority. Thus (*e. g.*) our General Convention could easily modify its constitution so as to give the force of law in the American Episcopal Church to the decisions of the Pan-Anglican Synod. We have seen how cordially the action of the Lambeth Conference was received in America.

One of the functions of the Synod would be the authoritative determination of the questions in doctrine which may arise in various branches of the Church. Priests, deacons and laymen should have the right of *petition*, and their prayers should be heard and determined in accordance with their importance and value. Thus, by the right of petition, every member of Christ would have a voice in the assembly; though it by no means follows that every petition should be read *in extenso* to the entire assembly. Another advantage of the Synod would be an approximation toward *a uniform Book of Common Prayer*. We have already remarked this tendency in America, and the same can be said of the Episcopal Church of Scotland. On the other hand we fear a tendency in the Church of Ireland and in some of the British colonies, in the opposite direction. The Pan-Anglican Synod would encourage the one and restrain the excesses of the other. We oftentimes wish that some slight and unimportant change *could* be made in our American Prayer Book, just to confound those who think that "dotting an i and crossing a t" is ruination, and that wisdom sleeps forever in the graves of our revolutionary veterans! The recent changes in our hymns have done something to avert "the cast-iron era" of the Church's history.

It is obvious that prayers for rules and services of a local nature must ever be provided for by national Churches. But we can see no reason why in all other respects we should not have *one general Book of Common Prayer*, wherever the English language is known; why the same lessons should not be read, and the same psalms and canticles be sung on both sides of the Atlantic. All that was best in the English, Scottish and American books, might thus be selected for common use. By our present law one General Convention must propose, and another adopt all changes in the Prayer Book. We would like it better were no change allowed, unless proposed by the Pan-Anglican Synod, and then ratified and adopted by the General Convention. And if the Synod met at

tated intervals, all mistakes and grievances could be easily reme-
lied. We tender then this olive-branch to all who desire import-
nt changes—*let it be the act of the whole Church.* We implore
ur Right Reverend Fathers, and the venerable and learned men
rho are to sit in the House of Deputies, neither to decide questions
rhich concern our entire communion at home and abroad; nor yet
o spurn the petitions of Christian men, who are earnest, sincere
nd resolute in their purpose.

Let us have a Pan-Anglican Synod, and then "Let us have
'eace;" but Peace only through *the Truth!*

ART. V.—A PLEA FOR A COMMENTARY FOR TO-DAY.

THE Study of the Parish Priest should be the work-shop for his
'arish. There, at least, should be found really serviceable im-
lements with which to work out the task of preparing homiletic
istruction for his people.

But so far as our experience goes, there is yet wanting a com-
act serviceable Commentary upon the Holy Scriptures. There
as been provided excellent material in the different notes, com-
ents, and catenæ we have been able to examine. Splendid
pparatus has been collected by the genius of some of the ablest
nd devoutest men of this age. But all this is yet raw material
hich has to be worked up by the Parish Priest himself, and then
und to be more costly, than useful, for the daily and hourly
eeds of his people. Devout comments by St. Augustine, earnest
hortations by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, fine comments by St.
erome, are well worth studying; but they are not directly appli-
able to the needs, more or less directly practical, and often con-
oversial, of the Laity of to-day. We do not undervalue these
ds. We would not imply that we would lessen the authority of
e Fathers—rather we would exalt their claims: but the *isms* of
-DAY have to be fought, not the heresies catalogued by St. Ire-
æus or St. Epiphanius. And so far as our observation goes, there
no Commentary that will meet them by a direct issue.

Of course we do not mean that we have examined *all* the com-
ents offered in late years, nor yet that we have examined those

which we use, almost daily, with exhaustive study. But daily use in the closet, and study, for parochial purposes, readily shows the defects as well as the excellencies of those most generally accessible, or which have won a deserved reputation. And again, there are certain crucial *tests* which each Teacher applies, perhaps unconsciously, perhaps positively, to the Commentary presented to his notice. These tests vary with the grasp he has of the dogmatic teaching of the Bible, or with his apprehension of the heresies, or errors, afloat in the community in which he labors, and of the consequent needs of his congregation. For the precise statement then of those truths—distinct and positive which he has to present—he should be able to turn to his Commentary, and find them stated with reference to their opposite errors. It might be objected that error is ever changing; that its phase to-day is different from that of yesterday and will be different from that of tomorrow; that the boast that Creeds are useless renders any refutation useless, except the clear enunciation, as a blast from a trumpet of the Creed itself. True, but a comment, that would apply to the false teaching current for a single decade, would go far to modify, and correct, the popular apprehension of these errors for the next decade. And that would be a great gain. The pulpit is the last place where those that hold error should be denounced by name. But the pulpit should be the chief place where these errors should be exposed, and branded, with the proofs of their just sinful consequences. There if any where the maxim, of condemning the sin, but sparing the sinner should be followed. But the pages of a Commentary are different. There the arena is changed, and the tenets of the different sects can be rightly spoken of with relation to their authors, and present defenders; courteously but positively. This is true liberality, right charity; for the truth is the only charity we should know; and its enunciation, as sufficient for all men, is the divine liberality.

The need then in the study of the Preacher and in the library, both of the Parish, and of the Parishioner, is a Comment for TO-DAY compact, clear, concise, filled with the germs of the doctrinal teaching to be expanded in the pulpit: by which the intelligent layman can receive that primary training which will render the deductions and conclusions of the sermon familiar to him as he listens in the Church. It should unwrap the present application of the precious

words of the Prophetic Scripture. We would apply this word Prophetic in its larger sense of 'teaching with a purpose of providing for future as well as present needs.' And so it would include nearly the whole Bible—certainly the larger part of the New Testament. And a comment properly prepared would show how past principles, even in the delicate phraseology that expresses them, apply most closely to the combining needs of present religious development. For as human nature varies within given limits, and its immediate phase is contingent on the mode of its civilization, yet it is ever the same at root,—so Revelation varies in its applications, yet is ever one. But the Church too is ever the same, while she rises in each age to the needs of the hour, and presents, in suitable garb, the unchanging truths she has received, and earnestly defends. The Tracts of St. Cyprian, the Lectures of St. Cyril, the Sermons of St. Augustine, the Homilies of the Reformation, the Sermons of Bishop Taylor, Dr. South, Dr. Barrow, Bp. Bull, are admirable, are full of deep thought; but they do not supply the present need of Liddon's Bampton Lectures, or of Bp. Moberly's able works. The times have changed. What is positive in their exegesis is of permanent value. The garb in which they clothed it has changed its fashion. Lord Bacon showed never so clearly his practical common sense as when he commended so highly the Body of Divinity then extant in the daily Sermons of the Church of England. We may echo his remarks in behalf of the usefulness of the Pulpit of to-day. Yet it does not come up to the argument of its Divine Theme, as it could, had the preacher giving fruit presented to him to pluck for feeding his congregation instead of the conserves, rich, rare, costly, of past ages. The student in his closet can find them very nourishing, but they are dainties palatable to the soul fed by longer and more vigorous study of the sacred text than is to be found generally among our laity.

The sacred text itself gives more present food. For it teaches immediate applications of fixed truth. Take an example, where the prophecy, the direct application, and the variation in time, all lie side by side. In the parable of the Drag Net, there *is* the prophecy for all future time. There was the direct application in the work of the Fishers of Galilee. There is the present application in the daily fulfilment of the work of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

The last fifty years have been more fruitful in accurately reproducing the text of the New Testament than any previous three hundred. Workers in this department have won high distinction, and we have now more living authorities laboring in this toil of love than can be mentioned in any two past generations. Bishops Wordsworth and Ellicott, Dr. Tregelles, Dr. Tischendorf, have gained proud titles. But in spite of the direct labors of the first two and of others there is needed the serviceable commentary which we have tried to suggest. There are defects in each, as also in the otherwise admirable works (on the Gospels alone) of Dr. Williams and Dr. Burgon.

We repeat we need a Commentary that will deal directly and concisely with the mistakes, and confusions and heresies, of the popular phases of the religious bodies of this day and will counterstate the Catholic doctrine.

It should meet the Romanist squarely upon the issues he endeavors to force from the words of Scripture. It should deal with the Immersion theory of the Baptists; with the Pelagianism of modern Methodism; with the Fatalism of the Calvinist; with the semi-infidelity of the Unitarian and Universalist. It should show the orthodoxy and Catholicity of the Prayer Book. It should direct attention to the distortions and dislocations of the proof texts which the different sectaries usually make.

We cannot test the Commentaries we have mentioned upon all these subjects. But we can readily see that they are deficient in many of them. For instance, we have not yet found the Commentator who shows that the famous text for immersion (Rom. vi.) does *not* necessarily bear the violent interpretation, the Baptist puts upon it. It seems to us that the XXVIIth ode in the I. Bk. of Horace, would throw light upon St. Paul's use of the word '*buried*' and lead the student to avoid the extreme conclusion the Baptist seeks to force from it. Even such a scholar as Maskel in his curious work on Lay Baptism yields it. And so opposite a thinker as Maurice in his Kingdom of CHRIST, acquiesces in this distorted use and attempts to soften the deductions sought from it. The point is this: Immersion was usual, but, by the very metaphor St. Paul uses, it could not be stringently administered in that form in *all* cases. Therefore the common opinion of what should be absolutely necessary for a burial, as the heathen teaches, would throw light upon a simile, used by the apostle, and addressed to a

mingled gathering of Judaic and Gentile converts, whose usages varied so much in this very custom of burial.

But even where we might expect positive teaching there too we are disappointed. For at least upon the claims of the Church to a true Catholicity and Apostolicity we ought to find something definite. But even in Wordsworth the author of the THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS we find this defect. It is assumed, of course, and readily enough, but it is not formally announced in passages where it might be expected. Let us test the Commentaries at hand by this touchstone in the crucial tests. We have before us, Wordsworth's Notes, Williams on the Gospels, and the Plain Commentary. At our elbow are D'Oyle and Mant, and Scott, the venerable, and ponderous. These we believe to be the most usual aids to the Text our clergy use. Before we press our objections let us record our highest admiration for the excellencies of the first three works and our respect for the other two. None of them need commendation from us. It would be useless and impertinent; but we choose to express our admiration that we may not be thought disrespectful towards those to whom we really pay a high reverence. Nor are we reviewing them as Commentaries but simply using them to illustrate the defects in the ordinary materials for exegesis which they supply.

Let us take a few texts from the Gospels as proof texts to test the correctness of our remarks. We will select first those texts where the authority of the Church is taught. Next where the authority of the ministry is enforced. And where there is positive instruction when these two are presupposed. If space then remains we will test Wordsworth's Notes on the Epistles. We will see that where we would expect decisive teaching it is not given. Yet we cannot think, in the face of contrary facts, that those Doctors would shrink from teaching the 'Truth, the whole Truth and nothing but the Truth.'

Let us select.

(*a*) St. Matt. xviii. 15-17. "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them tell it unto the Church, but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." The culminating verse is of course the 17th.

Upon this Wordsworth has this very unsatisfactory note—unsatisfactory because it leaves so much unsaid. "Our Lord had commanded His disciples not to give offence and to cut off what is most dear—to separate from our nearest friend—if he offends us, *i. e.* causes us to sin. But lest they should proceed hastily and haughtily in this matter, He prescribes the course which they must pursue in the exercise of discipline. He calls the sinner their *brother*, and commands them to deal with him privately at first, and if he hearkens to them and confesses his sin, then he does not say, thou hast inflicted punishment or obtained satisfaction but thou *hast gained thy brother.* And the more refractory he may be, the more eager thou must also be, as a patient and tender physician, for the restoration of his spiritual health. If one remedy fails, try another, and another. Take with thee one or two more, that it may be manifest that thou art ready to do all on thy part that may conduce to amendment and restoration. But if he will not hear them tell it to the Church, that through fear of being cast out of the Church by excommunication, and of the binding in Heaven, consequent on it, he may be so shamed and lay aside his malice. Our Lord threatens the sinner with these punishments, in order that he may repent and escape them. Hence he does not cut off the sinner at once from the Church but establishes a first, a second and a third tribunal in order that if he refuse to hear the first, he may hearken to the second or the third, and if he have no reverence for that, he may stand in awe of the future judgment of God. (*Chrys.*)

"17 (τῇ ἐκκλησία) *to the Church.* Our Lord had already *prepared* His Apostles for the use of this word ἐκκλησία (see above xvi. 18,) to describe the Visible Society of his faithful people. He had informed them who were to bear office publicly in it for the exercise of Godly discipline therein. (Comp. 1 Cor. v. 5, 1 Tim. v. 20) in His name and for the general good."

Then follows several references to Augustine, Chrysostom, Hooker and Hammond on the mode and measure of administering reproof, public and private. That on Hooker alone we could compare, and that was the discussion on Auricular Confession in Bk. VI. ch. 4, and is stronger than Wordsworth. Now let us quote the Plain Commentary. On 15th and 16th verses the comment is of the same tenor as Wordsworth.

But on 17th. And if he neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church:—This is that rebuke "*before all*" of which St. Paul speaks in his First Epistle to Timothy:—but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. By which words our LORD is clearly giving rules for conduct *among Christians.* He alludes to wrongs sustained *within* HIS *Church* and speaks of that Church as armed with powers of her own—powers which are accordingly found in full operation in St. Paul's time! The consequence of "neglect to hear the Church" (as this saying of our LORD clearly implies) can be none other than exclusion from Church membership; being cut off from the body of the faithful. Not that a man becomes thereby excluded

om the Church's sympathy: but by becoming like 'a heathen man (one of ose for whose Repentance and Conversion the Church toils night and day)— loses every privilege to which Baptism entitled him. And let none suppose at excommunication is a vain decree for—"'

Then the comment goes on to ver. 18. This is better, yet short what we hope to show the verses demand. Let us next take illiams on this passage (*Ministry*, 2nd year).

But if he neglect to hear them, or literally to hear amiss, *tell it to the Church.* ese words imply a visible society to hear and to speak, and with power to ommunicate or absolve; an allusion very intelligible to the Apostles, as it a power now exercised by the Jewish Synagogue, and taken from them conferred by CHRIST HIMSELF on HIS Church, which is to be the end. t *if he neglect to hear even the Church, let him be unto thee as the heathen n and the publican* (Matt.) Yet not that charity even here is to be at an : for St. Augustine in his Sermon on this passage, 'Though we esteem no longer as a brother, yet, not on that account is his salvation to be lected. For even the Heathen we consider not as our brethren, yet for r salvation we always seek.'"

There is after this a beautiful passage, but no wise bearing on point we would bring out. Now these verses to our mind bear y well a comment, including these points. (*a*) The passage in lf, this the three furnish very well, but (*b*) the true parallel in or. vi. 1-3 vs. (*c*) The Church's office as peacemaker. (*d*) The urch is the ultimate authoritative Arbiter in all such cases, from ose decision in the nature of the case there can be no appeal; ugh this authority is derived from her LORD and to be exercised ler HIM. These points decisively stated in few words would of more real value than the generalizations quoted above.

The next passage we would select is,

(*b*) Matt. x. 41. He that receiveth you receiveth ME, and he t receiveth ME receiveth HIM that sent ME.

Wordsworth bestows no comment at all upon it; but has rather ull one on the *next* verse, and an unsatisfactory one on the allel place in St. John xiii. 20. Williams likewise gives only s to the verse:

And now in the more immediate application of all this to the sending h of the Apostles. '*He that receiveth you receiveth* ME, and he that eiveth ME receiveth HIM that sent ME!'—an expression often used on erent occasions, and also with some variation, as 'He that heareth you reth ME,' and 'He that seeth ME seeth HIM that sent ME.'"

The Plain Commentary adds nothing but this, "A marvellous saying!" . . . . "Surely the sayings of our LORD, which are found to have been frequently on HIS lips, (and there are many such) deserve to be most attentively considered." But on the two following verses it bestows a tolerable consideration. Now the verse *is* most important, but why the learned Doctors should shrink from drawing the most obvious deductions from it, we cannot understand. To us, the verse is a most solemn one, to which the Laity should give great heed; and it, too, contains a warning to the clergy, to remember whose ambassadors they are. A concise comment upon it is needful for us, at this sect-plagued day, for it involves, in its pregnant wording, the real authority and power of the clergy. It would appear from the complaints that are brought to us that England, too, is not by any means so well grounded in this Truth that the Church can lay aside her declaration of its meaning by proper comments.

(*c*) We would next refer in general terms to the last discourse of our LORD, given in St. John's gospel. To us they are a perfect storehouse of positive dogmatic teaching. HE there gives to the Eleven undoubting and clear instruction upon the Unity of the Church, and the office of the HOLY GHOST. It has been our practice always to refer those seeking the Church to a close and devout study of these chapters; and, we believe, always with profit to their spiritual insight of the Work and Mission of CHRIST'S mystical body. But Wordsworth comments upon it generally in a devotional tone, scarcely touching at all upon the doctrinal teaching involved, at least, where it brings in, directly or indirectly, the office of the Church as an organic body. And especially is this the case in the solemn xvii. chapter. He does not seem to apprehend the grand undertone of the unity and continuity of the Church, which pervade this great intercessional Prayer, from its first words to the last. The Plain Commentary is somewhat better and succinct upon this subject; but it is far from satisfactory. Unfortunately our set of Williams' Commentary is defective in the volume on Holy Week, but from the references in the Plain Commentary it can scarcely differ in tenor from the other two.

It may be objected that these commentators do not write professedly a dogmatic and doctrinal exposition, but a devotional one. The plea may perhaps be admitted in behalf of Dr. Williams and

Dr. Burgon, but hardly for Bishop Wordsworth. His position has been too clearly and continuously controversial, and his Commentary contains too many doctrinal discussions, especially against Romish misrepresentations, to make that plea of any avail. But he makes no effort to meet the same evils which infest England as well as this country, and which have risen clamorously into such political importance that they threaten the disestablishment of the English Church. Thus it seems to us the like evils necessitate the like remedies which we are endeavoring to set forth as required practically here. The remedies can be compacted into a clear, concise, dogmatic teaching of Catholic doctrine, and a short, courteous and suggestive refutation of common schismatic, and heretical expositions. We claim that no amount of essays and volumes, slight or thorough, popular or scientifically theologic, partial or exhaustive, can supply or replace this necessity. A sentence here read in the connections, the sacred context supply, is worth ten pages of controversy. A definition or a deduction, legitimate and upon Catholic authority, studied under the texts it elucidates in the Bible, is worth fifty pages elsewhere.

Now we have really no exposition which rises to the height of the Church's exigencies to-day. The Fathers wrote for their own day. We must write for ours. Therefore every generation will demand a new exposition; new in meeting the varied shades of opposition or of feeling which are peculiar to each age; old in that it declares the unchanging continuity of the doctrine as well as the authority of the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Therefore the ancient expositors should be carefully studied, and their opinions stated. But we do not need, for the use of the Laity, that the Notes should be wholly from them. It is yielding the field of exposition almost entirely to schismatic works. For the mass of the Laity have little training fitting them to sympathize in Patristic expositions, but they *have* for clear nervous expositions in modern style. Let the Church be true to her trust. She has in this country men skilled enough to do her this service. She demands it. It is a tool for her work as necessary as the axe, saw, plane, and hammer of the carpenter. With such a comment, cheap and accessible, in the hands of her priests, (whether in parishes or in the mission field) which they can supply to their congregations, she can do double the work she does now;

for many who would not look at a tract or a defence of the Church and her claims, would readily read a comment. Her refutations would be far more convincing, for the false expositions would be refuted by the very context quite as much as by any argument, as soon as attention was drawn to the position of the passage. And the argument itself would be more powerful there than in the pages of a set essay.

Finally, we deem the need for such a Commentary imperative. The religious needs of the people demand that they should be supplied, and two sets of annotations are readily met with already. Either those which, professing to be in favor of no particular creed, emasculate their notes of all that can ever make them of the slightest value; or those which, filled with narrow and shallow exegeses that conveniently pass over difficult or annoying texts, are crammed with defences of some favorite sect. Either of these two find a ready sale. Is not the Church then called upon *now* to come forward and by like means vindicate her claims to be the Keeper and Interpreter of the Holy Scriptures for the masses? If we are right in urging that there is such a demand, which the Church has the men and the resources to supply, then we may point out, as a last remark, the line such a Commentary should follow. The fixed purposes in view should be in parallel lines to the popular errors. First, to illustrate and enforce the Creed. Secondly, to present, at the proper passages, such decisive and lucid instruction upon the mission, constitution and authority of the Church of CHRIST as may be practicable and practical, and to supply condensed arguments for common use. Third, to supply also direct disproof, as may be convenient, of popular delusions in religion which are based upon false or perverted teaching from distorted and mangled texts. We would by no means exclude the authority of the Fathers, but we would rather seek our sources in Waterland and Leslie and Bull, and Browne and Liddon—themselves grounded upon Patristic bases, but deeply engaged in the discussions of their several times. The coloring they would give to such an exposition as we know we need for ourselves and our own work, would be more popular with the Laity than one that was steeped in the beauty (to many so inappreciated yet really so devout and reverent) of Augustine's or Bernard's choicest eloquence.

ART. VI.—THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.*

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

WE have before noticed the progress of St. Paul's labors after the Council of Jerusalem to the time of his arriving at Derbe, and meeting Timothy. The latter was the son of a Jewish woman who believed, and was well reported of by the brethren at Lystra and Iconium. St. Paul chose him as a companion, and circumcised him. Shortly after they came to Thessalonica. (Acts xvii. 1.) When St. Paul was sent away from Berea, Silas and Timotheus abode there still. (xvii. 14.) When the Apostle had gone from Athens to Corinth, Silas and Timotheus came to him from Macedonia. (xviii. 1–5.) There was an abode of eighteen months at Corinth. First and Second Thessalonians were there written. Timothy and Sylvanus unite with St. Paul in the Address of each. In the Second Epistle Timothy is called "our brother and minister of God, and a fellow-laborer in the Gospel;" he had sent him to establish them in the faith.

Both Epistles were written from Corinth, during the eighteen months; and Dr. Davidson and others think that the Second was written about a year after the First. (*Introd.*, p. 449.)

Between the time of the Selection of Timothy, and the residence at Corinth, (a period probably of about a year), Timothy must have been ordained. We may assume that it took place at Lystra, and St. Paul allowed the Elders there to join with him in the imposition of hands.

We regard it as a settled point that there was but one ordination of Timothy; that it was conferred by the Apostle, the Elders, by his sanction, uniting in it. (*Ellicott's Past. Ep.*, p. 125. Dr. McKnight *apud Hobart's Apology*, p. 155; *Lange*, 1 *Timothy*, 53; 2 *Ibid.* 85 notes; *Watson's Theolog. Inst.*, *Methodist Church*, part 4, chap. 1.) One and the same transaction is referred to in 1st Timothy, iv. 14, and in 2d Timothy, i. 6.

An obscurity which Lange calls "a gap, not a difficulty," oc-

* Continued from the July Number.

Errata.—On page 266, line 53, for *Levitical* read *critical*. And on page 278, for Asiatic read *Adriatic*.

curs, viz: whether Timothy was sent from Athens to the Thessalonians, as the text literally indicates. The solution is, that he had been directed to go there from Berea.* After the expiration of the eighteen months and more spent at Corinth, St. Paul departed to go into Syria, to keep the Passover at Jerusalem. (Acts xviii. 18, 21.) Priscilla and Aquila are mentioned as going with him. Timothy is not.

From this time until First Corinthians was written, we have no trace of Timothy in any part of the Scriptures. This embraces a period of about three years.

Then we have in that First Epistle the following passages: "For this cause I have sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which are in Christ, *as I teach everywhere in every church.*" (1 Cor. iv. 17.) "Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear, for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do. Let no man, therefore, despise him. Conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me." (Ibid. xvi. 10.) "I look for him with the brethren," or, "I and the brethren look for him."† (Ibid. 11.)

It is almost universally admitted, that this Epistle was written from Ephesus, and during the last year of the residence of three years there. It seems to indicate that Timothy was there with the Apostle, yet he may have received directions to visit Corinth, when at some other place. Two deductions are plain and important. Timothy's ministrations were such as to bring in remembrance St. Paul's ways in Christ, "as he taught everywhere." His high station in the church is thus established. Next his visit to the Corinthians was to be short, and he was to return, or come, to the Apostle at Ephesus.

That between the date of the Second of Thessalonians and the First of Corinthians, this "fellow-laborer in the Gospel" was inactive, cannot be supposed. His field of labor is undisclosed.

We are warranted in saying that he came to Ephesus after First Corinthians was written, and the following texts enable us to

---

* *Conybeare and Howson*, vol. 1, p. 507. *Davidson*, 2, 442. *Lange*, 1st *Thessalonians.*

† *Whitby.*

ollow him somewhat further. "Paul purposing in spirit, when ıe had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go into Jerusaem, sent two of those who ministered unto him, Timotheus and Erastus, into Macedonia; but he himself stayed in Asia for a seaon." (Acts xix. 21, 22.)

"Now I will come unto you, when I shall pass through Maceonia, for I do pass through Macedonia. It may be that I will bide, yea, and winter with you." (1 Corinth. xvi. 5, 6.)

"After the uproar was ceased, Paul departed to go into Macedonia. ınd when he had gone over those parts, and given them much exhortation, e came into Greece." (Acts xx. 1, 2.)

"As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went (*was about oing*) into Macedonia."—(1 Timothy i. 3.) "Paul an Apostle of Jesus hrist, and Timothy our brother unto the church of God which is at Cointh, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." (2 Corinthians, i. 1.) his was written from Macedonia.

We deduce from these texts—

(1) That Timothy upon his return from Corinth, had been sent ıto Macedonia before St. Paul went there.

(2) That they were again together at Ephesus, and St. Paul equested him to remain there, when he was about going into Iacedonia. The Apostle went thither.

(3) That a short time after this, Timothy is found with St. Paul ı Macedonia, unites with him there in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and probably went with him into Greece. He was ith him in the ensuing spring, when the Apostle left Greece to o into Asia by way of Macedonia.

Allow two suppositions, and we have a narrative thoroughly onsistent, a sequence of events entirely harmonious, and can give ıll force to every statement to the letter. One is a short visit of Timothy to Macedonia and a return to Ephesus, before St. Paul eparted. The other, a short residence at Ephesus after the ıpostle's departure, and then rejoining him in Macedonia.

We have two clear proofs that Timothy was employed by St. Paul in missions and labors of brief duration. When the latter rent from Berea into Greece, he and Sylvanus were left at Berea, irected to go to Thessalonica, and in a short time joined St. Paul t Corinth. The visit from Ephesus or some other place to Corinth, efore noticed, was unquestionably short. We find that Titus

was sent with a brother to the Corinthians.* Apollos was also delegated for missions. In short we find, what the state of the Church would lead us to infer, that as exigencies arose in particular places, and the personal action of the Apostle was impossible or difficult, some one was deputed for the special purpose. This visit of Timothy to Macedonia may have been for some temporary object. We can scarcely doubt that the one to Corinth was special and brief.

But this supposition (of a return to Ephesus) is opposed by several Commentators. Its rejection is involved in their theory, that the Epistle was written between two imprisonments. Dr. Davidson cites Berthold and Hemsen, and Wiesinger adds Matthies and Huther as refuting it.

We have not been able to obtain the works of Berthold or Hemsen. But Huther has been carefully examined, and he informs us of the views of Matthies, and also of Berthold.

Huther, himself, advocates the Interval theory for the Epistles.

But he says that many Commentators, among them Berthold and Matthies, hold, that after Timothy had gone into Macedonia he did not go to Corinth as was intended, but returned to Ephesus, and there received the directions contained in the first four verses. The Apostle then left for Macedonia. Timothy soon followed him, and went with him to Corinth. Timothy was sent to Ephesus from Corinth before the Apostle left for Asia. St. Paul wrote his Epistle after his departure, and from Corinth, or while he was traveling from that place to Macedonia.

Now we observe that these critics find no difficulty in assuming that Timothy was but a short time in Macedonia, and returned to St. Paul at Ephesus, and received the first directions there before St. Paul's departure; nor do they find any difficulty in supposing that he soon rejoined the Apostle in Macedonia.

And we may add, that the numerous writers who support the theory of the Epistle being written from Macedonia after St. Paul went there subsequent to the riot, concede the same fact, of Timothy's return to Ephesus. (*Townsend's Notes*, 353.)

* The conjecture that Timothy was, in this mission to Macedonia,

* 2 Corinthians, xii. 18.

:o proceed to Corinth, is, we apprehend, untenable. Wiesinger ıssumes that he was to go to Corinth, (citing 1 Cor. iv. 17,) and ›resses the argument that he had not time to go there, to fulfill ıis mission, and return to the Apostle, within the period we can ·easonably assign for the continued abode of the latter at Ephesus. But we think it is sufficiently clear, that this visit to Corinth was ıt an earlier period of the three years than this to Macedonia, :hough probably not long before. We find as facts, that the Co-·inthians were informed Timothy was to visit them. They are listinctly requested to conduct him forth in peace, that he may :ome to the Apostle; that St. Paul and the brethren looked for ıim. This was written at Ephesus. And then we find Timothy ıt that place, and sent to Macedonia. Timothy thus finished this nission to Corinth, and came to Ephesus.

Undoubtedly the view of Berthold and others, that Timothy pre-:eded the Apostle from Corinth after the three months' abode and vent to Ephesus, and there received the Epistle, is fully refuted ›y Huther. The narrative (Acts xx. 3, 6), is explicit that Timo-hy and the others accompanied the Apostle into Asia. We are varranted in concluding that they sailed together from Cenchrea, he port of Corinth, to Philippi. There the others left St. Paul 'or Troas, and after the Passover he joined them there.

As to the immediate question we are considering, Huther says: 'Still more untenable are the hypotheses of Paulus, that the Epistle was written during the Apostle's residence at Cæsarea; of Schemerburgher, that it was written in Jerusalem during the period nentioned in Acts xxi. 26, (the days of the Purification); of Bottger, in Patara, or in Miletus. Against all these hypotheses, ›xists one fact, that they require an arbitrary interpretation of he passage in 1st Timothy i. 3. If we will not consent to an ırbitrary exegesis, and must cling to the hypothesis that the letter vas written during the time covered by the Acts of the Apostles, :here must be this assumption, that the journey from Ephesus to Macedonia, mentioned in 1st Timothy i. 3, when Timothy was left ›ehind, occurred during the three years' stay at Ephesus, but that St. Luke has not mentioned it." This is treated, of course, as listinct from the visit after the uproar. This assumption Huther ›roceeds to combat.

The arbitrary exegesis spoken of, or one branch of it, is this—

that the account in Acts refers to the same occurrence as that mentioned in 1st Timothy i. 3. This position these writers hold to be inadmissible. Thus Huther says, "All these circumstances prove that the journey of the Apostle from Ephesus to Macedonia, mentioned in the Acts, was not the same as that spoken of by him in 1st Timothy i. 3."

Huther's arguments upon this point, except that of St. Luke's omission to notice the return of Timothy, are directed against the fact of the Epistle being written in Macedonia, and do not touch the point that the departure from Ephesus for Macedonia, referred to in both narratives, was the same event. Bearing this very important distinction in view, we collate the statements.

From Acts we find, that St. Paul intending to go through Macedonia and Achaia to Jerusalem, sent Timothy and Erastus into Macedonia. He abode in Asia yet a season. At its close the riot caused by Demetrius arose. He then departed to go into Macedonia. He went over those parts, and then into Greece. The statement in 1 Timothy i. 3, is, When I was about going into Macedonia from Ephesus, I besought you to tarry still at Ephesus. So we have entire consonance in the intention to go to Macedonia, the actual departure, and not a shadow of inconsistency if we allow the reasonableness of a presumption that Timothy had returned during the *season* before St. Paul's departure. When we again advert to the vast number of Commentators who upon differing theories as to the Epistle, concede or assume this fact, we may aver that no theory exacts so little of conjecture as this.

Treating this as established, we next find Timothy with the Apostle in Macedonia, with him in Greece subsequently, and probably going with him to Greece from Macedonia.

This brings us to the consideration of the other supposition, that of the stay of Timothy at Ephesus, before he joined the Apostle in Macedonia being short. This is of some difficulty; and we shall endeavor to meet it. It is urged, if we take the departure of St. Paul from Ephesus as being about Pentecost (June) and that he wintered in Greece, being there three months, we can only allow six or seven months for his labors in Macedonia and journey to Greece. As Timothy joined him while in Macedonia, in time to unite in Second Corinthians, we cannot suppose that Timothy remained in Ephesus after the Apostle's departure more than three

or four months. But this time would be wholly insufficient for the task and office given him in the Epistle. They required a permanent or at least a very long abode.

We submit in reply.

The language abide still, "tarry on," rather indicates a temporary than a long residence. Dr. Ellicott appears to favor this view, when he says that if the present infinitive had been used (Acts xiv. 22,) the contemplated duration of Timothy's stay at Ephesus would have been more especially marked. In the present case no inference can be safely drawn (*Pastoral Letters*, 21. n).

But chiefly, the objection rests upon the confusing the recital of what had been previously requested, and first allotted to Timothy, with the general enlarged commission given in the Epistle. The two verses after the address, (the third and fourth) are distinct from the rest, referring to something which had taken place before, and had been before directed. "Even as I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went into Macedonia, in order that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine, nor give ear to fables and genealogies which minister questions, rather than godly edifying, which is faith—" This is rehearsed as what had then been directed, and all that had been directed or declared.

Then come the expressive words, *so do*, or according to Dr. Ellicott, *so I do now*. In a note to 1 Timothy (Lange, 1869, p. 17,) the Rev. Mr. Harwood renders the passage, "So now also I exhort thee." It is stated that the ablest Commentators agree in this.

It is impossible not to see the limited and inferior character of the evils to be averted by this first residence of Timothy. Some were to be charged to teach nothing but the true doctrine, not to attend to fables which led to curious unedifying speculations. To effect these objects neither a long abode, nor great powers were demanded.

But consider the residue of the Epistle, when the request is turned almost into a command. The Apostle speaks of the glorious gospel committed to his trust, that he had been counted faithful, and put into the ministry, and then—"This charge I commit unto thee son Timothy."

Then follow rules for his guidance in the future. The Epistle

is a great commission and the law of its exercise. It confers a large portion of Apostolic power and functions. It develops evils far more startling and menacing than before existed. It speaks of those who had made shipwreck of their faith. It predicts that some should depart from it, giving heed to the doctrine of devils. Then we have a series of rules as to the qualifications of a Bishop and Deacon; and Timothy is told that all this was to teach him how he might behave himself in the House of God—how govern the Church. He was to command, as well as to teach. He was to ordain Elders. He was to discriminate between Elders who ruled well (especially such as labored in the word and doctrine) and others. He was authorized to hear accusations against Elders. All now indicates a state of riper evils, and greater advancement, demanding higher powers and a more permanent abode, than what is pointed out in the first four verses.

We hold it both reasonable and probable, that all the objects of the first request had been fulfilled by an abode of a few months at Ephesus, and a greater need for his services in Macedonia led to his rejoining the Apostle there.

If this view of the succession of events can be sustained; if Timothy after a temporary abode at Ephesus for such temporary purposes, did again join the Apostle in Macedonia; then it seems almost a demonstration that the Epistle could not have been written from that place, on this visit. It is certain that Timothy was with him when he left Greece for Asia by Macedonia, at the end of the three months' residence. It is reasonable to suppose, that he accompanied St. Paul from Macedonia to Greece. We find him with St. Paul in the former place, and no trace of his being elsewhere, within the time necessary for the journey and those three months.

St. Paul then after such residence, being prevented from sailing into Syria, went by way of Macedonia. (Acts xx. 3). We trace Timothy with him, certainly to Troas in that journey. (Ibid. 4).

The Apostle went from Troas to Assos, to Mytilene, to Miletus, where he met with the Elders of Ephesus; thence to Ptolemais or Cæsarea, then to Jerusalem, where he was arrested, and the two years' confinement at Cæsarea began.

Now as we find Timothy and the Apostle together at Troas, and are without a trace of such a union from that time until the im-

prisonment at Rome about three years after, we are left to conjecture where Timothy was in the interval. No theory can be more plausible than that he was left in Asia Proper, at some place along the coast in the vicinity of Ephesus.

What we have stated and suggested excludes the idea of the Epistle being written at any time before St. Paul's separation from Timothy at Troas.

But there is another argument fatal we think to the supposition of the Epistle being before that event. Within a few days after leaving Troas the Apostle was at Miletus. He summoned the Elders of Ephesus to meet him there. He then delivered his farewell impressive sermon for their comfort and guidance. Now can it be imagined, that if the First Epistle had then been written, and the great commission given to Timothy, not a word should be found in this address referring to him? Timothy was delegated to govern the Church, at any rate during the Apostle's absence, and with ample powers. The latter was leaving the Elders with the apprehension of never seeing them again. Every reason which could have existed for conferring the power was likely to become more pressing and forcible. It is idle to suppose a revocation of an authority assumed to have been conferred some months before in Macedonia. And yet Timothy, and his position and sway in their Church,—Timothy just left, possibly present, is never referred to. Such an omission is consistent with the temporary and inferior authority bestowed by St. Paul upon his departure into Macedonia; but is inconceivable upon the supposition of the Epistle being written before this meeting at Miletus.

Again, how can the following argument be answered?

Timothy was left at Ephesus when the Apostle went into Macedonia. He was in Macedonia when Second Corinthians was written. This first Epistle then, if written in Macedonia, must have been written before Second Corinthians. It presupposes St. Paul and Timothy to be separated. Then the injunction to remain at Ephesus, renewed in the Epistle, was disobeyed. We cannot suppose the extreme improbability that Timothy had left Ephesus before it arrived.

We have traced the course of the Apostle to the arrest at Jerusalem, and imprisonment at Cæsarea. If the Epistle was not written before the meeting at Miletus, it is scarcely possible that

it could have been before that imprisonment. That lasted two years. Believing the interval theory wholly untenable, as we shall seek hereafter to show, there is no period in the life of the Apostle to which the Epistle can be assigned with greater probability of truth, than during this residence at Cæsarea.

We are aware that in this view, we encounter the great authority of Dr. Davidson; as well as of several German Commentators, (See *Introduc.* III. 14) Wiesinger refers to Huther as disproving it. Their leading arguments will be hereafter noticed.

In the first place there is nothing in the narrative of the imprisonment inconsistent with the supposition. There are several circumstances favoring it.

Although St. Paul was delivered into the custody of a centurion, yet he was allowed liberty, and his acquaintance were not to be forbidden to minister or come unto him. (Acts xxiv).

If we have succeeded in excluding any date for the Epistle prior to the meeting of the Elders at Miletus, this is the first period which can be assigned for it. There was at Cæsarea leisure and opportunity; and no date is suggested we believe by any author, between this imprisonment, and the interval period, five to six years after.

While the Epistle was clearly subsequent to the first request to remain at Ephesus, the language does not indicate the length of time between that request and its renewal; a few months only is required for the events which occurred between the meeting at Miletus and the beginning of this imprisonment.

The two great provinces of St. Paul's ministrations were Achaia with Crete, and Asia Proper. He had provided for the former by the commission to Titus. Just as soon as it became probable that he could not give a personal supervision, or that this would be long delayed, he would provide for the government, perpetuation, and faith of the Churches of his planting. He constitutes, therefore, what Wiesinger calls, An Apostolic Delegate, to meet the emergency.

Should he revisit the place, his authority would of course be superior. In the interval that conferred was to be ample. Now at Cæsarea, he had good grounds for a hope of ultimate release. Felix had trembled at his preaching, and dismissed him: at a convenient season he would hear him again. He would have been

'eleased by Agrippa, had he not appealed unto Cæsar.* That ıppeal was induced by an aversion to being tried by Festus at 'erusalem for offences against the Jewish law.†

Thus we find him in the Epistle expressing the hope of seeing Timothy "shortly," or "sooner than I anticipated,"‡ and then gain, not relinquishing hope, but conscious that the event might ıe far off, he says; "but if I tarry long, thou mayest know how o behave thyself in the house of God;" giving the reason for conerring power and imposing commands.

And what can we suppose were the meditations of the Apostle luring two inactive years at Cæsarea, circumscribed on the one ide by the Great Sea, on the other by the sweep of Carmel? The udden and wonderful magnificence of the first Colony of the Flaian family would not dazzle or engross him.§ Often must his houghts have dwelt upon the scenes of his former labors; upon he Churches of Macedonia and Greece planted by him; above all pon that grand field of his ministry, Asia Minor, and Ephesus s pride—magnificent and fickle Ephesus. The cry "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," would often be recalled in his musings; nd a fear of a return to idolatry, as well as a sense of the hereies and errors he had foreseen, must have awakened his anxiety o guard against them, and shelter and sustain the converts by the ıinistrations of one, whom he places nearly upon an equality with imself.

Here then was a meet opportunity to meditate, to methodize, to mbody in a permanent record the precepts and lessons, before elivered orally, to enlarge them, to increase the authority before estowed, to secure the polity of the Christian Church for the ime, and consummate it for all the future. Those precepts and lesons to Timothy were not for him, or the Church at Ephesus or in ısia, alone, but were to endure in their sacred truth, for all ages, or every Church, in every land.

Many objections to this hypothesis are found in the arguments sed in defence or contradiction of the position, that this, with ıe other Pastoral Epistles, was written during the interval period.

---

* Acts xxiv. xxv. xxvi.

† *Ellicott* p. 64.

‡ Ibid.

§ See a striking description of the city in Calmet, *in verbo.*

Thus, St. Paul tells the Elders of Ephesus at Miletus, that "they should see his face no more," and they left him "sorrowing most of all for the words he had spoken, that they should see his face no more."* Yet in the First Epistle to Timothy he says, "I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mightest know how to conduct thyself in the house of God." "Till I come, attend to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine."†

It is said Timothy had been requested to abide at Ephesus; the Epistle was addressed to him at Ephesus; and St. Paul expected to go to him there. There is then, it has been urged, a contradiction between the predictions in Acts, and the expectation in the Epistle, only reconcilable on the theory, that the Epistle was written before the farewell.

Dr. Mc Knight and Bishop Henry Onderdonk supporters of the interval date, reply: No question of faith or practice was involved.

The Apostle spoke from strong fears of the result. What the Holy Ghost did witness (*communicate*) to him, was only that bonds and afflictions awaited him. The rest was the earnest expression of affectionate apprehension as to the future

Dr. McKnight states another argument thus. "But it may be asked, what occasion was there, in an Epistle written after the Apostle's release, to give Timothy directions concerning the ordination of Bishops and Deacons in a Church, where there were so many Elders already?"

He answers, "that the number in the year 58 might be too few in 65. That false teachers had entered, to oppose whom new ministers were necessary to replace the losses by death."

This reply of Dr. McKnight has of course greater weight upon his theory than upon the one now suggested. There would be upon the former six or seven years between the meeting at Miletus and the writing of the Epistles; upon the latter, not over two years.

But another answer seems decisive. The power to ordain Ministers was to be a permanent power, looking to a succession in the Church. The authority to regulate and to discipline was also to be centinuous. Even if restricted to Ephesus, these were lasting powers, stretching over the future. But they were not limited to Ephesus. There is a marked agreement among the learned, that the office and authority of Timothy extended over the Province

* Acts xx. 25-35.

† 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15; iv. 13.

afterwards known in the Church, as Asia Proper, or Proconsularis. There is reason to suppose, it was even more extensive.

It is again said, that the heresies condemned in First Timothy could not have grown up, without the lapse of many years, and forbid the idea of an early date. Our hypothesis alllows of the lapse of nearly or quite two years from the meeting at Miletus to the Epistle. The time of the appeal to Cæsar may plausibly be conjectured.

This position is one taken by those writers who deny the Pauline character of the Epistles. It depends upon establishing, that the nature of those heresies was plainly such as were developed at a later period, say in the Second century; that no trace of them is found in books allowed to be genuine; and that the improbability of their existence in the Apostolic age is clear.

Wiesinger in an elaborate argument examines these propositions. He comes to the conclusion, that all that are indicated in the Epistles existed in the Apostolic period; although he places the Epistles at a very late date of that period. He is an advocate of the interval theory.

The turning point on this branch of the subject is, in Bauer's language, "that the heretics of the epistle are the Gnostics of the second century." Now Wiesinger argues, that if this be true, what is said of the heretics must fully correspond with the Gnostics of that century. "Though allusions in the Epistles might correspond with particular features in the Gnosis, that would not be enough to show that they belonged to the second century." Very strongly is it observed by him, that Bauer himself has admitted that elements of the Gnostic system were in existence before the time of Christ, viz. Judaism. It is they who deny that these Epistles were written by St. Paul, who press the view now considered; but one of them is driven to admit, that the historical notices preclude their being placed later than the end of the first century.

We submit, that if four to five years were sufficient for the development of such phases of heresies as the Epistle exhibits, about two years cannot be deemed unreasonably short. The dwellers in these lands were precocious in their intellects as well as in their vices. Grecian or Oriental genius required but little time to give birth to new theories and fanciful and false doctrines. A short period would suffice to mature the errors and heresies disclosed in

the third and fourth verses of the Epistle into all the corruptions subsequently noticed, and to sow the seeds of all that was predicted for the future. The Apostle at Miletus had prophesied the entering of grievous wolves, teachers of false destructive doctrine among them. A tenet of Gnosticism, the resurrection of the awakened soul from the death of ignorance to the life of knowledge, would ripen soon in minds which were proud of a separation from the vulgarity of pagan faith. One extreme development of this heresy, the denial of the death in the body and resurrection of Jesus Christ, existed among the Corinthians, and is the subject of the great fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to them. St. Jerome says, "that the body of Christ was declared to be a phantom while the Apostles were yet in the world, and the blood of Christ was still fresh in Judea." (*Apud. Wadd. Hist. of the Church*, p. 70).

But the writers who have vindicated the Pauline authorship, do essentially vindicate our theory of an earlier date for this Epistle to Timothy than they assign, because they cannot but fail in showing, that the corruption of faith disclosed, could not have been the fruits of about two years as well as of five.

It is again urged that the development of the Church polity and organization in the Pastoral Epistles; the detailed rules for the choice and ordering of the Bishops and Deacons in First Timothy; a system so matured, was inappropriate to the Church until a much later date; did not belong to it; and is nowhere disclosed but in these Epistles.

This view is mainly urged by those who deny the authenticity of the Epistles; and the argument is really this. The hierarchical principle, as it is termed, is found developed in the second century. The Epistles contain that principle. It is not found in any other part of the New Testament allowed to be genuine. Hence these Epistles could not have been written in the Apostolic age.

We understand that Bauer is considered as one of the ablest of the impugners of the authenticity. His arguments are elaborately stated by Wiesinger, and the answers of the latter and other writers seem very satisfactory.*

The argument of Bauer contains the propositions above stated, and is curious. He insists that the hierarchical system, (Episcopal

* *Clark's Foreign Th. Lib.* xiii. 58.

superiority) had no existence until the second century. But the Epistles contain the plainest declarations and assertions of such a system, prescribe rules, under the professed sanction of Apostolic power, for its exercise; and provide for its continuance. In short hierarchy is as clearly developed in them, as by Ignatius in the second century.

As a branch of the same argument Bauer refers to the extreme care evinced in the Epistles as to ecclesiastical government, and the regulation of ministry and members of every class.

Next he contends that there is not a word in all the other New Testament writings, which sustains such a system, but much which contradicts it. And while admitting that we must associate a certain oversight and superintendence with the first rise of a Christian Congregation, he holds that "the oldest among the first converts became Presidents of the Congregations," as they were formed.

And somewhat singularly he regards this early constitution of the Church as strictly monarchical. An absolute power of government was vested in these Bishops or Presbyters, those terms being applied to the same class of persons. The democratic theory, as it is termed by other German authors, is discarded by him.

Another writer, De Wette, adopts the same theory, but makes the development of Episcopacy to have taken place at the end of the first century, an unfortunate admission for his argument, as Wiesinger observes, (on *Philippians* 75. *For. Th. Lib.* xxiii. p. 168).

Wiesinger's line of reasoning in opposition to Bauer, is, that a presbyter did not, by virtue of age, and being "a first fruit," become the head of a congregation, and thus represent a monarchical principle;. but although regard was had to these circumstances, he was chosen or ordained by Apostles, probably with the consent of the people. The system was not that of a single presbyter to a single congregation; but several congregations formed one body, and the presbyters collectively ruled over them; and this lasted until the Episcopal element prevailed.

But what is the system of polity presented in the Epistles? It is plain, and allowed by the mass of writers, that Elders, Presbyters or Bishops, were ordained by the Apostles for churches, as they planted them. And let it be conceded now, that these

terms for a considerable time, indicated the same office. Deacons are addressed as a class in the Epistle to the Philippians. Wiesinger insists that there is little reason to doubt the existence of such office-bearers in the Apostolic times. Without referring to the offices of Teachers, Pastors, etc., we have in these two classes, ministerial functions plainly vested.

And what more does the Epistle show as to further ministerial rule? It shows the delegation of Apostolic authority to Timothy to ordain Elders, to rule Elders, and the Church at large; such a control and supervision as the Apostle himself could exercise. It cannot be better stated than in the language of Calvin, as to the Epistle to Titus. "Paul wrote with the design of arming Titus with his own authority for sustaining so great a load. For it cannot be doubted that he ran the risk of being set at naught by some, as if he was of no special account among the pastors. Hence we may infer that Paul did not so much write privately to Titus, as publicly to the Cretans. . . Since due honor might not be shown to him, Paul invests him with his own authority, both in ordaining ministers, and in the entire direction of the Church." (*Introduction to the Epistle*, quoted by *Lange*, *Epistle to Titus*, p. 2, ed. 1869.)

We are not dealing with the question of the high importance of this part of the apostolic polity upon the question of transmitted Episcopacy; only with the point of the alleged incompatibility of such a feature in that polity at the early period we assign for this Epistle to Timothy. It is obvious that the time when such a system would be adopted, if it originated with an Apostle at all, would be governed, *first*, by the growth of the church, and next by the inability of the Apostle to meet its needs, by personal supervision. Before the imprisonment at Cæsarea, St. Paul had established a great number of churches in Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, and Crete. One accusation against him was, that not only at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, he had turned away many people. Such an enlargement of the church in those regions, as it diminished the power of the Apostle to supervise it, called for and produced the appointment of another in his place, endued with part of his essential power.

Add to these considerations the fact, that St. Paul anticipated a long absence, to state the case no stronger, and we have every

notive combining for deputing Timothy to govern in his stead, at this very period.

Among the arguments which the advocates of the late date of the Epistles, as well as those who question their authenticity, use, are the injunctions as to widows in the fifth chapter of 1st Timothy. It is urged that here was a development of a church institution, which could not have taken place at so early a period of her history.

An examination of all the passages upon the subject, shows—

That there were widows in the church, indigent, religious, and with none to provide for them; that the church assumed the duty of succoring them; that a list was to be kept, and none admitted to regular support under the age of sixty years. Certain qualifications were to be possessed to make them "widows indeed," whom alone the church was to relieve.

So early as the appointment of Deacons, we find widows the object of solicitude and charity; and when Dorcas was restored to life, the Apostles called the saints and widows, and presented her alive.*

The advanced age required may have been on the assumption, that those within it, might be able to support themselves. The condemnation of idleness by the Apostle is frequent and marked.

There is not the semblance of difficulty in any passage, except in verses 11, 12, and 13.

Young widows were to be refused, because they would wax wanton against Christ, marry, and cast off their first faith; besides, they would grow idle, wander from house to house, etc.

These widows† in the 14th and 15th verses, he enjoins to marry, to rule the house, etc. Then is the direction to all believers connected with widows to relieve them, that the church be not charged, that it may relieve those that are widows indeed.

Again, young widows were to be refused, because if they did not marry, they would be idle and tattlers. The widow indeed, one to be relieved, trusteth in God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day.

---

* Acts ix. 41.

† The learned, I believe, agree that the widows, and not women, are meant in the 14th verse.

In all this there is not a word indicating a vow of any kind; not a word implying a *quasi* ministerial character.; not a syllable as to an instituted body, a *Collegium Viduarum*, as it is termed, nor an order of Deaconesses. A class is defined for which the church is to provide. Who shall receive its aid are pointed out, the qualifications stated, and also who shall be refused.

The opinion of Dr. Davidson, that the Order of Deaconesses was in existence and referred to,* is very fully examined, and we think refuted, by Wiesinger,† who however, considers that such widows occupied a station of distinction and honor in the church. He admits that there is no other passage in the New Testament which proves the existence of such an institution of widows, or even of its beginning in the Apostolic era. It may, however, be deduced from pages in ancient writers, chiefly Tertullian and Clemens of Alexandria, that such an institution existed at the end of the second century. That it was traced back to the Apostolical directions in this Epistle to justify it, would be very natural, even if wholly indefensible.

That the church allowed such a body, regulated it, appointed a form of ordering them, possibly with imposition of hands, is to be granted. (*Bingham*, 1, 284, 292.) The question is, what did this Epistle declare, or ordain? It is absolutely certain, that it formed no order, but only regulated the conditions upon which widows should be the objects of the general charity of the church.

Another argument is used. It is said that there is a marked resemblance of style, thought and expression in the three Epistles, so much as to lead to the conclusion that they were written about the same time; and as second Timothy was written during the last imprisonment, we must adopt that as the date of the others.

If the views we have submitted are correct, the Epistle to Titus, and the First to Timothy, were written within less than two years of each other. The argument can have little weight as to these. But Dr. Hales' reply to Paley, upon this matter, seems satisfactory. The resemblance may justly be ascribed to the identity of the situation and circumstances of Titus and Timothy. The object and aim of the Epistles were mainly the same, viz: the regulation

---

* *Introd.*, vol. III, pp. 36, 37.

† *Wiesinger, First Timothy; Foreign Library*, vol. 23, p. 482, et seq.

the exercise of the powers conferred upon them, and the warn-
g against [redacted] of a kindred nature.

We trust this investigation has tended to throw some light upon
is interesting question, and leaves the argument for the place
d date of First Timothy being at Cæsarea, toward the close of
. Paul's imprisonment, the most reasonable of all theories, and
ee from any serious objection.

Art. VII.—THE CRITERIA OF THE FAITH.

The word faith, as it is commonly used, has two meanings. It
used, first, to mean objective or outward faith, or those things
e are to believe. It is used, secondly, to mean subjective or in-
ard faith, or the power, faculty or disposition of soul by which
e believe—by which we take hold of and realize the objects of
ith. The discussion carried on in these pages relates to the ob-
ctive faith; and the purpose of this discussion is to point out a
ew which will conduct the mind with authoritativeness and cer-
inty to the true objective faith.

There are two general depositories of this faith. The first are
e Holy Scriptures, which, as the inspired oracles of God, are the
iginal source of faith. The second is that visible body called the
hristian Church; for the Christian Church, being built upon the
ith as its foundation, must needs be a depository of that faith,
ut both the Scriptures and the Christian Church are depositories
the faith in a general and indefinite sense. In the Scriptures
is not set down in a scientific, technical, abstract way, but is
ffused through them without method or precision; and it is this
hich has given occasion for founding upon the Scriptures oppo-
e and different systems. And as regards the Christian Church,
hile this Church is built up upon the faith revealed, and so must
a depository of the faith, yet such is now the unhappy condi-
n of the Church, that at first view it is impossible to say in what
rt of it the true faith, in its absolute integrity, is to be found.
e Christian Church is grievously divided into various parts or
anches; and many of these branches differ among themselves on
is very point, as to what the true faith really is. All of these

branches no doubt hold a part of the true faith. In some one of these branches at least, if not in more, the faith, in its integrity, must be found; for the promise of Christ has been given to keep the light of His full truth always shining in His Church. But in what particular part of the Church the truth or faith is to be found, does not for the reason just mentioned, at first sight appear. While, then, both the Scriptures and the Christian Church are depositories of the faith, yet the former are so written, and the latter is now in such a condition, that the first view of them does not point it out. Now, in this state of things it should be expected, that there would be a guide or clew to this faith. We find that there is such a clew; and this clew is derived from the Holy Scriptures and the Christian Church considered together.

Let us now endeavor to find out what this clew is. This clew seems the result of an argument, brief, simple, and conclusive; and the first step in this argument is, *that the one faith delivered by Jesus Christ and His inspired Apostles was a faith which was never to change, but is precisely now what it was at the beginning, and what it will continue to be until the end of the world.* This is the position taken by at least every Protestant body. The principle animating all systems of belief (at least in the Protestant world) is, that the Scriptures reveal one, unchangeable faith; and the claim of each particular system is, that itself is the expounder of that one, unchangeable faith. That the faith revealed in the Scriptures—whatever that faith may be—is *one*, a thing fixed and absolute, results directly from the unity of God. Scripture is by no means the comments of men upon Scripture, but the *sense* of Scripture is Scripture; and that sense is, and only can be, one, since God is one. If Scripture teaches the doctrine of the Trinity, it does not teach Unitarianism—if it teaches the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, it does not teach Universalism—if it teaches an Atonement through the Blood of Christ, it does not teach an Atonement through any other means. The truth or faith revealed in Scripture is one; and that this faith was *never to change* is shown, 1st, By the essential character of Christianity. 2d, By the express words of Scripture.

1st. It is evident from the essential character of Christianity, that the faith revealed by Christ and His inspired Apostles, was never to change. For consider; Christianity came from the hand of Christ completed and perfect, and so unchangeable in its char-

acter. Christianity was full-grown at its birth, and in this respect stands alone. In other things perfection is the result of a gradual growth from an imperfect beginning. There is, for example, the steam engine. How perfect is the present steam engine, compared with the first one made! The first steam engine was comparatively a very imperfect machine. But, from time to time, improvements were made, and the result is the steam engine we now see; and doubtless improvements will continue to go on—improvements which will put the steam engine made twenty years hence far in advance of those now in use. In regard to the things of this world, perfection is the result of a gradual growth and improvement from an imperfect beginning. But Christianity came from the hand of Christ completed and perfect; for Christianity is contained in the revelations made in the Scriptures by Christ personally, and by Him through His inspired servants—and these Scriptures are a completed and perfect revelation. After the revelation made by Christ in the Holy Scriptures, there were to be no more revelations—and in fact there have been no more revelations. As, therefore, Christianity was revealed by a Revealer who was perfect—as it was revealed for the benefit of a human nature essentially the same in all ages—and as it was revealed in a revelation which ended and was completed with the disclosures made by Christ in the Scriptures—therefore Christianity came from the hand of Christ completed and perfect. And hence the objective faith Christ revealed (which is the heart of Christianity) was revealed a completed and perfect faith. And this faith being perfect, we are thereby taught, that it cannot change, that it must be fixed, that it remains one and the same from the beginning, perfect in itself, and so incapable of being increased or diminished. And thus, from the essential character of Christianity, we learn that the faith revealed by Christ was never to change.

2d. It is evident from the express words of Scripture, that the faith revealed by Christ and His inspired servants was never to change. St. Jude in his Epistle, says: "I exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was *once delivered* to the saints." The faith, then, which men are to receive, was once delivered (so the Scriptures tell us) by Christ and His inspired servants, and having been once delivered, it is not to be delivered again, but is to continue unchanged, one and the same from the

beginning. And hear what St. Paul says to the same effect. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, writes: Though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." And to confirm the impression contained in these words, thereby showing their special importance, the Apostle repeats them in the next verse, saying: "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other Gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed." It is, then, St. Paul's testimony, that the Gospel, doctrine, or faith which he had taught—the very same which the other inspired servants of Christ had taught, the very same which Christ Himself had taught—was to remain one and the same, unchanged and unchangeable, so that if thereafter, he should teach any other doctrine, or even if an angel from heaven should teach any other doctrine, he or the angel would be a deceiver, and must be held accursed. Again, St. Paul tells us in his Epistle to the Ephesians, that: "There is one Lord, *one* faith, one baptism." One Lord, one faith in that Lord, one baptism in which we profess that faith. Scripture here teaches us that the faith we are to receive, is *one*. But how one? Not simply, as some might say, because it is the same every where at any one time, but because it is essentially the same at all times, because it is unchangeable. The necessary faith revealed is here said to be one just as our Lord is one, just as baptism is one. There are not two baptisms, but one baptism. Baptism is here said to be one, because in its nature and administration it was to be unchanged, remaining for all time one and the same. And for the like reason the faith revealed by Christ is said to be one, because it was a faith which was never to change. Again, there are not two Lords, but one Lord. Our Lord is here said to be one, because He changes not, because He is for all time our one and only Lord Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever: therefore He is one. And since the faith revealed by Christ is one, just as our Lord is one, that faith is one, because it is the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever—because it was never to change.

It appears, then, both from the essential character of Christianity, and from the express words of Scripture, that the one faith Christ revealed was never to change. In certain quarters we hear of a doctrine called *development*, development of the faith. But

there can be no such thing as a development of necessary faith. It is true indeed that the *language* in which this faith is expressed, may be developed. What is called the Nicene Creed is an instance of this. The Nicene Creed and the Apostles' Creed, in point of doctrine exactly fit each other—they cover precisely the same ground. But in the Nicene Creed, as compared with the Apostles' Creed, we see a development of the language or scientific expression, not a development of the faith or doctrine. To repeat, the language in which the faith is expressed may be developed, and there may be a development of the practical power of this faith in the heart; but the development of the faith itself, as of something incomplete, is a delusion and a snare. The objective truth made known to us by Christ, the necessary faith revealed by Him, is, and has always been, one and the same, a faith which is essentially unchanging and unchangeable, which is not to be added to nor taken from, but which, having been once revealed a perfect faith, remains fixed and unchanged forever.

The first step in the argument was to show that the faith revealed by Christ was never to change; and this step having been taken, let us now proceed to the next step—which is, that this faith which was never to change, *has always been preserved to the Christian Church.* The Christian Church is that one Society of believers which was originated by our Lord Jesus Christ, and has been perpetuated from Him. The oneness or unity of the Church is essential and indestructible. There may be divisions, or different branches, and between these branches there may be bitter controversies and want of communion and kindly feeling; but this state of things, though involving those who have brought it about in a vast amount of shame and guilt, does not affect the essential unity of the Church, as that unity arises out of its *origin and derivation from one source, Jesus Christ.* Between the different branches of a family, there may be hatred and estrangement, but the family is never the less one, because it is derived from a common ancestor, and has one blood; and so the Christian Church has an indestructible oneness or unity, because it has been perpetuated from one source. Now, when it is said, that the true faith has always been preserved to the Christian Church, it is not meant that that faith has always been preserved in its perfect integrity, to every branch of the Church; but this is meant, that by the divine Providence, the true objective faith has never ceased, has never become extinct, in the

Christian Church. And that this is so appears, 1st, From the character and design of the Church, and 2d, From the plain teaching of Scripture.

1st. What is the design of that divine society, called the Church? Is it not to be the keeper and witness of divine truth? Is it not to exhibit to the world the faith Christ revealed, to hand down that faith from age to age? Most clearly. It would be supposed, then, that, although the Church to-day, and during a considerable part of her career, stands marred, through the folly and wickedness of men, by division and estrangement, yet that being a supernatural kingdom—supernatural in its preservation, as well as in its origin—the design for which its divine Founder instituted it would never be thwarted, that is, that the true faith would never cease or become extinct in it. But

2d. That the true faith has always been preserved in the church, appears from the plain teaching of Scripture; for Scripture teaches that Christ left to the Christian Church the perpetual legacy of His Spirit for this very end. Consider these words, addressed by Christ to His Apostles, on the eve of His ascension: "Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The context shows that the promise contained in these words, relates to the Christian Church. Our Lord is here speaking of the Christian Church. He had just given to the Apostles and their successors, as governors of the Church, this great commission: "Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Then these words immediately follow: "And lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." This promise could not have been addressed to the Apostles personally or individually, since it was a promise which was to be effectual, even unto the end of the world; but, as the context shows, it was addressed by Christ to His Apostles and their successors in office, as governors of that spiritual kingdom, of which they were the twelve pillars, Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, as representatives of that Christian Church over which they were now, in the place of Christ, visibly to preside. Evidently, therefore, the meaning of these words—"Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world"—is, that Christ was to *be perpetually present with His Church.* But how present, and for what end? His perpetual presence with His Church could not be the presence of His Humanity; for His Hu-

manity, when this promise was made, was on the eve of Ascension into the Heavens. Nor could this perpetual presence here promised be that general presence of God in the world which is necessary to the world's existence; for a particular, special presence, is here referred to. There can be but one other presence of Christ, and that is His presence by His Spirit. So, this perpetual presence of Christ with His Church, promised in the above words, is and can only be His presence by His Spirit, that Spirit which is called in the Scriptures "the Spirit of Truth," (John xv. 26,) because its function was to keep the Church in the knowledge of the truth or faith, that is, was to preserve the faith (which is the essential truth) from becoming extinct in the Church. What other sense can we affix to these words of Christ—"Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world?" But the Scriptures make this clearer. A short time before His death, Christ said to His disciples: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter (which is the Spirit) will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." Christ ascends to heaven, and, as a consequent of His ascension, sends to that Church, over which He had visibly presided, the Spirit, to supply His place or presence, and hence called "the Comforter." Now, in regard to this Spirit the Scriptures teach, it is affirmed, two things—1st, that it was to abide with the Church forever; 2d, that it was to preserve the Church in the knowledge of the truth, or the faith (which is the essential truth); and hence this Spirit is called "the Spirit of Truth." Let one plain text suffice here. In terms which ought not to be misunderstood, Christ says: "I will pray the Father, and He will give you (when I am gone) another Comforter (to take my place) that He may *abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth.*" If the Spirit of truth was to abide perpetually with the Christian Church, is it to be thought that that truth or faith which the Church was instituted to exhibit should ever become extinct or be lost? Were it ever to come to pass that the essential truth or faith should fail throughout the whole Church, could it be said that the Spirit of truth was with the Church? And yet the infallible promise of Christ is, that that Spirit shall abide with the Church forever. He who fairly reads the 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of St. John's Gospel, is taught, that the visible presence of Christ in the Church was to be sup-

plied, after His departure, by the Spirit; and that while this Spirit was to affect the immediate Apostolic Church in an extraordinary and miraculous manner, it was still, *as the Spirit of truth*, to abide perpetually with the Christian Church; and for what other end was it to abide therein, than to keep that Church in the knowledge of the truth or faith?

Now it is clear, that this promise of Christ, thus to be by His Spirit with His Church, could not mean that every branch of the Christian Church should always be kept in the true faith. That would be directly against facts; for we know that one particular Church affirms that to be essential truth which another particular Church denies, and both cannot be right. And yet the promise of Christ to dwell forever in His Church by His Spirit, and thereby keep it from all vital error—from the belief of what is essentially false, and from the non-belief of what is essentially true—must be an effectual promise? What then is the scope of this promise? It is, that the true faith should never fail or become extinct in the Christian Church—that, though in one quarter of the Church some parts of this faith may be denied, though in another quarter this faith may, by false doctrines, be covered over and partially obscured—yet that the one, true, and full faith should never become extinct or lost in the Church, but should continue to shine therein, even unto the end of the world. The essential faith of the Christian Church is the rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. The Church is a supernatural kingdom, and her faith, which is her life, is protected by supernatural means. This faith is never to fail or become extinct, but, by the sure promise and word of Christ, will, in its complete integrity, be preserved in the Church perpetually. We conclude, therefore, from all that has now been said, 1st, That the one faith Christ revealed was never to change; 2d, That this faith was, by the promise and word of Christ, never to fail or become extinct in the Christian Church, but was to be preserved to it forever.

It follows directly from these premises, that the objective faith taught by Christ, runs back in an unbroken line to the beginning of Christianity. It further follows, that if any point along this line can be found, where the whole Christian Church agreed in the profession of the same faith, that faith must for all time be the true objective faith; for otherwise it must be concluded, either

that the true faith has failed throughout the entire Christian Church, which is against the promise and word of Christ, or that His faith has changed, which is contrary to what has been shown. Now, it is affirmed, that for the first three hundred years after Christ the faith set forth in the Nicene creed, that faith which propounds to us the great essential doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Forgiveness of Sins, the Resurrection of the Dead, the Judgment and the Everlasting Life, was the faith, and the only faith professed by the entire Christian Church. If, therefore, the above reasoning be correct, this faith must be the true objective faith revealed by Christ for all time; and this is the faith held and taught by the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country.

This creed is the foundation on which the Episcopal Church rests. It is the Church's distinguishing feature, by which the judgment men form of her should chiefly be made. We sometimes see a commotion within her pale, occasioned by such a movement as that of Ritualism, or by the extreme opinions of individuals on these points upon which a latitude of opinion is allowed. These, however, are perturbations which may cause the Church momentarily to vibrate in her course, but cannot control that course. The essential feature of a Church, that which gives it a permanent character, is its creed or faith; and the faith of the Episcopal Church, it is repeated, is that historic creed which has just been spoken of; a faith which is commended to us by the two essential qualities of stability and truth. We are to note that this creed, while it is the creed of the Episcopal Church, is not a creed which the Episcopal Church originated, but which she, as a branch of the church Catholic, is, in her sphere, simply *the means of transmitting*. As she did not make the creed, she cannot change a syllable of it. She *receives* this creed. This creed has come down to the Episcopal Church of to-day, as the ancient, historic, Apostolic faith, which she must accept, and pass on to posterity—which she can neither add to nor take from, which she has no power in any way to alter. The creed is an immovable, unchanging body of divine truths, fairly raised beyond the sphere of speculation and doubt. Outside of these doctrines set forth in the creed, there is, in Scripture, a wide and magnificent domain, where the mind may expatiate, where private interpretation may be lawful, where

a reverent speculation is allowable. But the foregoing considerations instruct us, that the doctrines of the creed are taught with an authority and certainty which must lift these doctrines out of the regions of doubt and debate, and make them no longer fit subjects of controversy; a rock-like, immutable faith, upon whose truth and stability the soul of man may rest and be satisfied.

Let one more word be said. If the essential recommendations of a faith must be, at all times and in all places, its truth and stability, how strongly is a faith, so recommended, commended to the American people! America is emphatically the land of many beliefs. A wild license in the private interpretation of Scripture, has borne its proper fruit. It has left nothing settled. It has kept the most sublime and vital doctrines in the region of doubt and debate. It has multiplied, almost without number, systems and sects, whose religion is but a sentiment, often warm, impassioned, beautiful, yet still but a sentiment, lacking that fixedness and strength which grow up from the basis of an assured historic faith. In this confused state of things earnest men are often bewildered, and know not where to turn to find the truth.

It is from this numerous class of men that the Roman Church hopes chiefly to win recruits by presenting her firmly knit and powerful system. While the faith of the Roman Church, through her doctrine of development, is liable to perpetual change, and from time to time has actually changed, and has so piled up upon the ancient faith a mass of error, yet in her changeableness there is a certain stability. In her asserted doctrine of infallibility she has an alchymy by which these additions to the faith, as soon as they are made, are turned, as it were, into stone; and it is this fixedness in her system that forms the most alluring aspect in which she presents herself in a country like this, upon whose troubled waters are found floating so many loosely constructed and unsatisfactory phases of belief.

While these systems have (many of them) a large amount of truth, but lack stability, and while the faith of the Roman Church, on the other hand, has stability, but is chargeable with a large amount of error, it is affirmed, upon the authority of the foregoing considerations, that the Episcopal Church in this country, together with that Anglican Communion of which she forms a part, joins the fullness of truth with the fullness of stability. Her position

is the "via media," a position which loses none of its reality and importance from the frequency with which attention is directed to it. As virtue is the middle part between two vices, so truth is the middle part between two errors. The Episcopal Church in this country, in the truth and stability of her ancient historic Creed, is indeed, and it is her glory to fill this position, the "via media" between Romanism on the one hand, and Sectarianism on the other.

ART. VIII.—CLERICAL ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES.

Reports of the Annual Meetings of the Society for the Increase of the Ministry for 1868–9. *Hartford.*

ACCORDING to its Constitution, the Society above named seeks to attain its object in two ways. It professes "to find suitable young men for the Ministry"—which is the direct method; and "to aid them in acquiring a thorough clerical education"—which tends indirectly to the same result by removing an obstacle that, otherwise, some "suitable" persons could not surmount.

It happens, however, that practically the indirect mode of attaining the end in view, becomes much the more prominent. Little is said of the steps taken to "find" young men, while the Reports and Addresses spread before us in full the labors and successes of the society in supporting and educating its beneficiaries. We say this, not as pointing out a fault, only a fact, for which, moreover, we can see no explanation. It may be that the society says less of what it does in looking up young men and inclining their minds towards the ministry, because such labor involves personal details unmeet and indeed impossible to be told. It may be, also, that this kind of work belongs rather to the sphere of the parish, and to those who have the immediate care of souls. We take the fact in question, however, chiefly as a token that indirect influences are at work to oppose the preference of young men for the ministry, numerous and powerful enough to account for the scantiness of our clerical ranks, even though no mention be made of the direct attractions of the world. The lack of means to prosecute one's studies is, certainly, to be considered as no more than one of those indi-

rect hindrances to the choice of the clerical profession. It can rarely be insuperable to a determined spirit. With heart and conscience responding to the inward call, his would indeed be a feeble will and unenergetic temper, who could not find or make a way to support himself, while preparing for a work to which he felt himself already virtually consecrated. But there is an earlier stage in his progress, when his mind is under the sway of much feebler influences; when his inclinations are first tending to the religious life, his resolves not yet fixed. The suggestions of an over-prudent friend, or of some worldly companion, or of his own inward doubts and fears, will then be not unlikely to exercise a determining power. Among other secular considerations, the question of support will, at such a time, appear very serious. Nor is it any impeachment of the sincerity of his devotion, that he shrinks from the many restrictions upon his natural liberty which the ministry imposes, and of which straightened circumstances furnish but a single class. Though these obstacles bear no comparison with the great principles and motives on which his choice should depend, yet they are not to be slighted, nor the impression they make on his mind to be regarded as a sign of mere weakness. Whatever helps to clear them from his path does him invaluable service, even, perhaps, to the extent of determining whether or not he is to be a minister of CHRIST.

Regarding the matter in this light, we are presented with many more obstructions to an entrance into the ministry than that with which this Society specially deals. They are of the same general kind, but more subtle in their influence, and therefore not capable of such direct and effective handling. No one of them does the whole work with any one person. They act in combination. Each contributes something to the result, in various proportions, according to the character and circumstances of those who come under their influence. The general effect is always the same: to render the ministry unattractive; to hinder the youthful mind, even when religiously trained, from turning that way; to check the rising enthusiasm which not seldom is excited by the first idea of the lofty occupations and motives of the ministry; to satisfy the spirit that has begun to entertain the idea seriously, with very inadequate reasons for putting it aside. It would be scarcely possible to enumerate all the causes that hinder young men from

becoming candidates for Holy Orders. No just estimate can be formed of the numbers between whom and the ministry this world plainly and openly interposes itself, compared with those who decline the sacred service from motives not distinctly irreligious. Whether or not this class be the more numerous, it excites at least a peculiar interest. One cannot but regard it with somewhat of that feeling which the LORD Himself indicated towards the young man, who only lacked one thing to complete the act of self-surrender. CHRIST'S call to follow Him reaches many minds that show at first a readiness to comply; they hesitate, and finally draw back from motives not so direct and simple as the love of great possessions, but nevertheless capable of being resolved into similar worship. They come so near using a great opportunity that their loss of it creates a keener regret.

The tenor of these remarks, however, may mislead our readers into expecting a more serious treatment of the subject than we propose. We propose, indeed, nothing like a treatment of the subject itself, but only to touch on one or two points that are wholly subordinate. Looking over two or three of the late Reports of the Society named at the head of our article, we were struck by the fact already noted, how much of effort was called forth to remove what, after all, cannot be regarded as more than one of the minor obstacles, to the increase of the ministry? How many more of these outward influences, indirect but powerful, were at work, was our next thought; and so we were led to a train of ideas which, though not of primary importance, seemed well worth presenting to the minds of those who are interested in this subject; happily, a numerous class, if the long list of patrons and subscribers in the Reports before us may be taken in evidence.

Let us say again, that we are not about to regard the subject in its most serious aspect, but to speak of some minor impediments to its fair consideration by those to whom that idea is suggested of entering the ministry.

The class of difficulties to which we refer, is connected with the estimate in which the ministry is held by churchmen generally, and the world at large.

There is no point in regard to which a young man is more sensitive than the position which he is to occupy in society on his first entrance into life. His feelings on the subject are manifested, not

so much in respect to the relative importance or dignity of his future occupation, whatever it may be, as to the personal consideration he shall have from those who meet him. The precocity of Young America is so remarkable, not to say appalling, that one who counts his half century can perhaps hardly venture to draw upon his own youthful experience in illustration of the ways of thinking that accompany adolescence in these later years. Nature does not radically change, however; and life has still its spring time when the buds open modestly, and the rising shoot is tender, and the tints are delicate. We are persuaded that the boys around us do not all get to be men without passing through some such season, however shortened it may be by the change that seems to have taken place in our moral climate. It is at that period that the boy thinks most of becoming a man; makes much of the daily increasing tokens that his manhood is dawning on the eyes of others; flutters in spirit when some call is made upon him to sustain his natural dignity; fancies himself in all imaginable positions that manhood can occupy; notes with keenest observation whatever in them is gratifying or offensive to personal feeling, and takes his cue how to esteem place and professions from the signs, none is quicker to interpret than he, of the estimate the grown-up world puts upon such things. From fifteen to twenty years of age youth is most impressionable under such influences. And in what light is the ministry too often set, at this sensitive period, before eyes that are so jealously observant of everything that lessens the sense of personal importance? Not in its own intrinsic worth, nor as it is presented on a deliberate survey of its advantages and drawbacks as compared with other modes of life, but under impressions for the most part produced by the prevalent tone of society—flippant towards all sacred things, and, if not contemptuous, yet showing an utter skepticism as to the reality and force of motives that profess to be controlled by higher and holier things than worldly gain, temporal ease, and physical comfort. We need not instance, for our present purpose, the grossly offensive forms in which this criticism upon the professed aims and motives of the ministry expresses itself. But do not our young men come in contact every day with a more effective, because not so bitter and prejudiced, disparagement of the ministry? Are they not habit-

uated to comments of this sort among persons not disposed to speak lightly of religion or its ministers?

The topic, we will suppose, is the relative standing of the ministry as a profession among the many others that invite a choice.

A very respectable profession, indeed—is the courteously expressed opinion—but hardly to be chosen by a young man of spirit and energy. He will put himself at a great disadvantage by so doing. There is not the harmony between the Ministry and the Age, there once was. It has fallen behind, so far as it keeps its old character; or rather, it has eddied off on one side of the great current of life. Some men make their mark in it, as they would under any circumstances. There are those who confound making a sensation with making a mark. But for the rest, it looks like a harbor where a large number of craft that dare not spread sail to the outside gales, rock peacefully on the gentle undulations of the parish and the parsonage. It is a profession in the main of small incomes, very often miserably inadequate and irregularly paid; but taking into account the average of moderate livings, earned without that downright hard labor that other occupations require. If it is little, it comes easily. The clergy are, to a considerable extent, men of literary leisure, by whom many an hour that is a working hour for other men, is spent in the stillness and repose of the study, made attractive according to their taste, and welcome as a place of shelter from out-door annoyances. They set their own hours. They arrange their work, to a great extent, as suits their own convenience, and manage sometimes to give it the go-by when not agreeable, no one being the wiser. Not questioning their usefulness as members of society, it may be allowed that they do not seem so necessary to its very existence as some other classes. Trade, art, science, are the very pillars and buttresses of society, manifestly upholding the whole structure. The ministry answers rather to its slighter parts that cannot well be dispensed with, indeed, but do not palpably impress us with the idea of their essential importance.

The above paragraph fairly indicates, we believe, the habitual tone of what is called "society," when expressing itself on this subject. The sum of its criticism is, not that the clergy are idlers, but that they are, as a class, her Forcible-Feeble of society. They are busy enough, but in a weaker way than other men; less ener-

getic, less telling. Of course, such an estimate of ministerial labor is founded, either in skepticism as to there being any value in spiritual offices, or, at least, without due consideration of the real effect produced even on the temporal course of affairs by such an order of men. Whatever the account to be made of it, it is not the mere unworthy expression of a baseless prejudice. It indicates how the matter really looks to those who only glance at its surface. There is an apparent exemption from the necessity of incessant toil, that constitutes a marked distinction of clerical life. The clergy seem indeed free from that stern compulsion under which the merchant, the lawyer, or the artisan, have to put forth their utmost and unintermitted exertions to carry on the grand business of life. How far this appearance is a reality, and whether it justifies a lower estimate of the worth and dignity of the clerical profession, are points that deserve to be seriously considered.

We care not, then, to deny that this apparent exemption from that sort of pressure under which secular business is ordinarily conducted, is a reality; rather, we claim it as a privilege of the clerical life. It is one of the compensations, and no slight one, for many temporal drawbacks to which that life is subject. As such, it may properly be pressed upon the attention of young persons as an advantage to be enjoyed with a clear conscience and full self-respect, even though other men make it the occasion of disparagement, both personal and official. How much such disparagement is worth may be understood when we consider what the indications are of that comparative ease which invites such criticism.

To begin with the simplest: how suggestive is the mere contrast between the scenes in which business men and clergymen spend their days—the office, the counting-room, the shop, and home! To the business mind home is the synonym for ease. To be at home, and to work, are contradictories. To which the preference is given depends much upon habits and temper. The spirit of our people seems to find a pleasure in the scenes of business, far above any that home can afford. Still, we have not lost all our sympathy in the sentiment of the greatest of songs—"There's no place like home." Many a man is loath to leave it, even for a day. Many a house-father as he shuts his door behind him, sighs at the contrast of the scenes through which he must pass till he

s again at eve. And that return—how welcome after a day ! What relief to the over-worked spirit ! What a mighty ss that soft domestic circle is against the host of outside Perhaps a mind genial enough to feel all this, would not ırp to note and criticise the happier fortune of one whose f daily occupation has its centre at home. Nevertheless the ands, and it seems to indicate an easier life, less energetic, oductive of results, than that which engages in the struggle forum and the market. The general look of things, not ose consideration of details, affects popular opinion. The difference speaks for itself. Other men go off to their work lace for work only; the clergyman stays at home amid its ing associations and its frequent opportunities for a self-in- ıt spirit; and can it be that his is not a life of ease compared heir's ?

judge fairly, one must take average cases. The pastor of a city parish occupies his domestic fortress under a state of siege. "Died of a door-bell," was the epitaph one of them ıted for himself. There are rural parsonages, on the other whose heart-music is sounded by "muffled" drums, indeed; key-note is given by the drone of a bee on a still summer But in all ordinary cases, the sphere of the clergyman's though its centre be at home, demands as much as any form or those qualities of activity, industry, method, promptness erseverance which constitute an energetic life in whatever or place developed. We speak not now of the sense of duty f spiritual responsibility, the pressure of which when duly o form of secular exigency can exceed. Taking merely the rd routine of work—the elements of which are study and sition, visiting, parochial business and public ministrations— ıires, in order to be run off smoothly and successfully, a sort ntion and amount of exertion utterly inconsistent with any f leisure, wholly incompatible with ease. That this is really ds no citation of instances; it is within the observation of an. If it be duly considered, we feel no concern lest any l be left in his home-life to disparage the energy and effi- of the clergyman. We have no hesitation in admitting that nuch at home, in his own quiet study and amid his family is a privilege he enjoys above other men. He has a right

to it. It comes to him in the natural order of things—capable, as any other advantage or benefit is, of being misused; but, in that proportion in which it is providentially mingled with his daily lot, a healthful relief to labor, a temporal alleviation of the penalty of toil granted him in return for his willing consecration of his whole time and strength to his Maker and Redeemer. Let other men allow him its use ungrudgingly. Let him ever maintain his privilege in this respect unabridged by false shame, or unmanly fear of unjust or unkindly criticism.

The sailor in the ballad, thought that "the gentlemen of England" lived "at home at ease," for he had no notion of toil in any other shape than his experience furnished. The compulsion of the winds and waves was too direct and peremptory to permit the idea of any milder constraint. So it would seem that men in secular life think that no real necessity can be imposed, except it be by that most imperative of Task-masters, "Business," who, if his servants break his rules or neglect his work, mulcts them ruthlessly in financial loss or ruin. Grant that the clergyman has real and important work to do, who *makes* him do it? We business men have to accomplish our task in set hours; there is no "let up" to the obligation; there is small chance of postponement or substitution of one sort of work for another. The hod-carrier with his pile of bricks and ladder before him, hardly has his work for ten hours more sharply marked out than we have, if we have energy enough to push business, or if our business has life enough in it to push us. Now compare with this the clerical day. No doubt some things must be done therein when the particular time for them comes, but how large the liberty of apportioning time to work, of selecting the work to come first, of postponing what is unpleasant, and slighting what is disagreeable! These are indulgences that blunt the very edge of toil. This is liberty which it is not in man to neglect; he will use it to the full. And if he does so use it, is he to be called a worker by the side of the almost slave to business, such as nine men out of ten are, if they would keep their head financially above water—much more, if they aim to ride the topmost wave?

Well—there is some truth in this, but, as in the previous instance, no more than may be claimed as a reasonable privilege, when we take into account some things which these writers leave

out. We have already hinted at one assumption on their part that can by no means be admitted, viz., that there is no sufficient constraint to work where there is no immediate penalty. We doubt if the annals of the exchange could produce an instance wherein the necessities of trade drove a man to greater exertions, than did that "necessity" which was laid on St. Paul to preach the Gospel. Is his a case of exceptional enthusiasm? The same constraint, proceeding from the same principles, acting in the same way, is felt in some real measure by every man who has sincerely taken the vows of the ministry. It regulates his work as strictly as though he were laboring under the eyes of an overseer. It holds him to an account which he cannot escape, except by such obtuseness of conscience as cannot exist where there is ordinary fidelity to ministerial obligation. It is not commonly thought, we trust, that any considerable number of the ministry go through any one day, much less a succession of days, without consciously confronting their ordination vows, if not directly, yet as their work itself reminds them of its sacred character. If this occur even in slight measure, it will prove no slight interference with that freedom to dispose of their work and their time at their convenience, of which the Clergy are sometimes supposed to make full use.

In the case of the majority of those who have that care of souls, we believe that it renders duty the controlling principle of the whole day. Such an assertion made of sinful and weak men however high and sacred their vocation, must be taken with many allowances. Take them all, and the result will show, as we verily believe, on the part of the ministry at large, a conscientiousness in doing the day's work, in its natural order, without evasion or neglect, that will bear comparison with the labor of any class of men in the community. For the most part, men of secular business perform their work in private. The Parish Priest has an attraction for "neighboring eyes" beyond that of beauty, so that if he falls short it cannot fail of observation. There is a little world of people that know when the Parson takes a drive, or gossips on the corner, or reads a novel, or dawdles round his house, or comes down late to breakfast, or fails to be when and where he should be and makes lame excuses for it. Granted that there may be, in certain cases, too much of this; that there may be a slighting of duty that eludes even suspicion; it scarcely lessens the

force of the truth, of which there are abundant tokens, that the sense of ministerial obligation is constant and powerful enough to *make* men work, even though they seem left to themselves in those incidents of labor, that are fixed for other men in the very forms of the business they engage in.

Deeming that we have thus disposed of what is unfair in the criticism, on the comparative liberty in work which clergymen enjoy, we accept the remainder, as simply indicating one of those compensations which are providentially granted to the ministry for many temporal disadvantages. If any one of our readers is of the class to whom the opening of the Article referred, we beg him to consider well this token of the large and generous spirit in which the Great Master deals with them when He invites them into His service. He is no task-master. He brings them into no such Egyptian bondage as characterizes most departments of secular business. Even in giving them work enough for all their faculties of soul and body, He treats them as His freemen, not His drudges. They shall arrange for themselves the forms and methods of their work, distributing it through successive days and portioning out their time according to their unfettered judgment —unfettered save by the one grand principle of subjecting every thought to CHRIST. In such a service there may be no wealth to gain; not much of social distinction; little that gratifies our earthly taste: but does any other service exist so generous in its spirit, or that so recognizes and calls out the higher qualities of our nature? He whose feet may stand on this height must needs take many downward steps to reach the level of secular business.

Fine words, indeed! but, beside what the proverb tells us fine words won't do, they will hardly be effective enough to dissipate the notion that, after all, the Clergyman's life is comparatively easy—there are so many points in its favor. It is a home life. It is unconstrained by rule, and forms of business. And, what seems more indicative still of its character, it is a life in which the holiday element largely enters. What with summer vacations, and attendance on society and other gatherings, and trips to the consecration of Bishops and Churches, and going to town or out of town "for a day or two," Parsons, like blackbirds, are frequent on the wing, and fly over time and space enough within the year to

suffice for a decade of journeyings,—say, for the whole Board of Brokers.

In reply to all this we ask but a single question. Is the Clergyman to have no Sabbath?

It seems to be a very common opinion that there is no such day for him. As to the reality of his Sunday there can be no question; f his work is ever ardent, it is then. The day of rest for other people is for him a day of toil. But when their labor begins again, is it not usually expected that his will simply continue, with a change of form but without any real intermission?

Such we believe to be the experience of every man who has the care of souls—at least in the larger parishes whether of town or country. Not only does every day bring with it ample work—as he *knows*, though some persons undervalue it—but ample proof that his people expect him to be working. It is true that there is a sort of charm on his part of a right to feel "Mondayish" which to a certain extent is admitted. But the assertion of this claim resolves itself generally into something very different from taking rest. Now and then, of a Monday morning, he will betake himself to some place where "*parsons* most do congregate" for an hour or two of clerical gossip. Or, if he live in the country, he will make his occasional trip to town, and rub rusticity off by contact with the great world. Usually, however, the second day of the week is that when the clergyman picks up and sorts away the odds and ends of duty that admitted of being postponed till he was at leisure. It is often his busiest time, on which he counts to enable him to dispose of the many small matters that stick to and prick his conscience like burrs, till they get what attention they require. So that Monday is no real Sabbath to the Clergyman.

Now it should be considered that rest from toil is as much a part of the Sabbatical idea as is religious worship. The argument that tells most with the world at large in favor of reclaiming from labor one day in seven is that such abstinence is suited to our nature: we need it for refreshment; we are made stronger by it; we do more in the six days, in the long run, than we should in the continuous efforts of the seven.

Does this rule hold good only in regard to laymen? Is the grace of orders so angelic that the man who receives it is taken out of the ordinary conditions of humanity, and made superior to

weariness, indifferent to relaxation, the more refreshed in proportion as his strength is kept in active exercise?

No such mediævalism is admitted by this practical age. Holy orders confer no such character—if they confer anything special at all. Clergymen are but ordinary men, as this age is careful to remind them, being itself unhappily reminded of that fact by too many significant tokens.

Well then—if in no respect exempt from the weaknesses of humanity, why should clergymen not enjoy their Sabbath? Why should not one day in seven of rest from labor be assigned to them as much as to their fellow mortals?

Our readers will perhaps wonder at our asking this question, as it was answered by the established usage of the day! The clerical Sabbath is a distinct and publicly recognized institution. It is not, indeed, of weekly occurrence, but it comes round once a year. It goes by another name, but it is the same thing. The summer vacation is the Clergyman's Sabbath, and a fine time he has of it! He draws his salary, and does no work. He goes off to the Land's End, if he pleases. He suits his taste in his pleasure, and takes it without stint. Rod in hand, he traces up the brook under the gentle stimulant of the Angler's craft. Gun on shoulder, he strides the ground over in the keener excitement of the hunt.

He seeks a solitude or society, as his fancy leads him to the quiet farm-house, or the fashionable hotel. One month of this life is freely accorded him; six weeks of it are not uncommon; even two whole months are not denied. Who shall say that he does not get rest enough? Whose share of this kind of enjoyment is greater than his?

Let us see if this be a fair statement of the case.

First, so far as it applies only to the Rectors of the larger city parishes. But whether one's parish be large or small, his right to one-seventh of his time is not affected.

Moreover, this summer vacation is not altogether ungrudged, even for those who can enjoy it. When extended beyond a month it occasions no small grumbling among the Laity who stay at home. Should there be no grumbling, there is a style of remark not pleasant to hear. These Parsons take life easy, says one. We bank clerks would like to change places with you, says another.

is well enough for gentlemen of your cloth to take a long va-
tion, but we men of business are glad if we can get away for a
w days only; and so on through a variety of 'odoriferous' com-
arisons.

But stop! you who are disposed to be so critical; let us treat
is matter in a business way, and square accounts between Clergy
id Laity in regard to their respective periods of rest and relaxa-
on.

To begin: we set down to the lay side of the account fifty-two
ays in every year that are clear holidays, so much is theirs, not by
ecial agreement or by favor of their fellow-man, but by Divine
ight GOD gives it to them, and makes Himself answerable for all
sults that follow the use of His gift. He takes the burden of
cular care from their shoulders. For that number of days, not
ly *may* they—it is their duty to put aside the anxieties of busi-
ss, and the pressure of affairs that is so recurrent throughout the
eek, and so wearying. The call to religious worship and the re-
raint upon mere secular occupation and amusement, may be so
garded as not to interfere with, but rather to aid repose of mind;
promote real and pure enjoyment—the more intense by the
rce of contrast. It is their own fault if Sunday be not, to the
aity, of this high character. It is unquestionably their fault if
be not at least a day of rest from physical and mental toil.
dd, then to the number of days thus marked out others that are
gally and by custom exempted, and there are more than two
onths in every year of clear holiday to a very large class of per-
ons. Every community, indeed, must have its hewers of wood and
rawers of water who are stinted of their fair share of rest; and
ere are some spirits that have such a facility of making slaves of
emselves, that they virtually do nothing but hew wood and draw
ater, let their occupation be what it may. For our present pur-
ose, however, the fact is firm and broad enough that two months
f holiday are enjoyed in every year by most Laymen. Most
aymen also, take a vacation at one time, of a week or more.
or does the year go by without a day here and a half day there,
et free from business: so that the clergy are outnumbered fifty
o one by the class who may if they choose—and it is the choice
f most of them—have nearly if not quite one-fourth of the year to
emselves. The minority is very small of the clergy who, even

with their demi-semi-Sabbath of Monday, enjoy an equal amount of holiday.

Now, in view of all this, is there any thing unreasonable in the amount of indulgence which the clergy have in taking holiday here and there throughout the year, as they can get it? No doubt they suit themselves therein as other men cannot. But the actual sum in days and weeks of this sort of indulgence being larger on the lay side, let the clerical advantage be ungrudged of greater freedom to consult their own pleasure.

We are quite aware that, in all that we have said we may seem to have been picking out the pettiest points of a very serious subject and giving them undue importance. It does not disturb us. That largeness of mind that looks down on petty things and is impatient of being detained among them fails, for the most part, to impress us, simply because it is so apt to be most loftily exhibited when the interests of other persons are concerned. The man who pooh-poohs the small anxieties and annoyances of other men, usually slaps his own mosquito as vigorously as any one does. These insect stings of petty criticism no practical mind ever overlooks, nor contemns the sensitiveness that is affected by them. They do not proceed always from pettiness of spirit, but are oftener the result of inconsiderateness. They are such remarks as are dropped casually when the current of light conversation touches on the subject. This is the kind of talk that your people most engage in; the source of many, if not most, of their opinions, the influence that largely shapes their estimate of things around them. And it is just in this style of conversation that the disparaging remarks about clergymen and clerical life of which we have been writing, are most frequent. It is no slight matter. It helps largely to form the disinclination to the clerical profession which most young men feel. When counteracted by deeper convictions and stronger feelings, it still remains to annoy and disturb the sensitiveness of spirit with which most young men appear before the world in the part which they have chosen. They like their choice to be thought well of. They keenly feel the little flings which society discharges like pellets as it were with the thumb and fore finger, against the "white choker" and the "black frock" and the professional ways of "the Parson," but which hit and smart like harder missiles sent with vigorous aim. It is well to

give such things some serious attention: to let it be seen that if we choose to enter the lists in such a contest, it is not the assailed who will be shamed.

If it were possible, we would deepen the solemnity of the process through which the Church brings her young men into Holy Orders. No word of instruction and warning, of her appeals to the heart and conscience should be omitted; not a tone of her voice should be made less awful. Nevertheless, there should be some place and mode found to recognize the fact that youth is still youth, even though set apart for the most sacred of offices. At some point of its course—rather at all points it should be made to feel that there is sympathy for those earthly hopes and fears, likings and longings, which as our nature is constituted, it would be simply monstrous for a young man not to have, whether his vocation be secular or sacred. The labor would not be lost were pains taken to strengthen our candidates for the ministry against this particular form of their trial. A Seminary Dean could hardly make better proof of the reality of his office than by manifesting an ever ready sympathy—the less formal the more effective—with these natural and not all culpable weaknesses of those over whom he has charge.

It would be no unworthy nor inefficient contribution to the increase of the Ministry, first, were it possible, to create a sound public sentiment as to the lawful forms and measures of clerical indulgence, and then, to give full and natural weight to all that, in this respect, is likely to attract a young man. Such influences are, doubtless, among the lowest to which he can be subjected. But in their measure they are lawful, and nothing that is lawful under the divine rule is really low. At all accounts till age, and the discipline of life, and the experience of his ministry, have matured his character, he will be susceptible to such influences to their full extent. They will not be more easily restrained within measure by ignoring them.

If there be any earthly attraction about clerical life, any special privilege, any indulgence that cannot be had elsewhere,—though ever so trivial in comparison with the grand principles and ends of the ministry—let it be openly claimed and maintained as such. The world at large will not less respect or trust the Ministry for the frank acknowledgment of this common bond of nature, "that

makes all men kin." They who are drawn into the ranks of the clergy will not be less firmly held to their high service for the grasp laid upon the weaker as well as the nobler part of their being.

ART. IX.—TRACTARIANISM AND VOLUNTARYISM.

DENOMINATIONAL religious organizations find relief for their internal difficulties by separation. They resemble families whose members unable to agree conclude to live apart. Such a remedy in the Church is prevented by the conservative power of our Episcopate. The election of the Bishop to a place in the Apostolic Succession, his solemn consecration to his holy office, the responsibilities of his lofty position, and the whole genius of his order make him regard schism at first with suspicion, and at last with horror: and this circumstance, combined with a latent attachment even in restless spirits to our Primitive form of Government, presents a barrier against disintegration. As the Episcopate preserved ecclesiastical unity in the early centuries of persecution when Christianity became diffused amid all the nations of the world, so is it our cohesive power in this age of divisions and revolutions. Perhaps this consideration more than any other explains why the Northern and Southern sections of the American Church, sundered for years by the fearful contests of civil war, were with the restoration of peace, brought at once into a complete and cordial harmony. But the very obstacles in the way of separation are arguments for our fraternal concord. If the family is compelled to dwell under the same roof conciliation becomes a necessity.

Yet with every conceivable inducement for unity, it cannot be disguised that our American Church is rent with the most deplorable divisions. Individuals are alienated. Households are disturbed. Parishes are divided. Conventions too often seem like battle-fields. Perhaps, more injurious than all, the two great sections of our mission work appear almost like hostile forces foraging in different territories, instead of being united by a common interest, a common sympathy and a common command in the same great object, at home and abroad, of evangelizing the entire world. Nay, schism has assumed the form of an organized defiance against the

awful authority of the Church on the very ground that she has corrupted the Faith, and is hence incapable of proclaiming a pure Gospel.

To heal such divisions we have considered the chief aim of this Review. This single object explains the whole course of the present Editor. He has been hopeful of contributing something to such a result. He believes a magazine can be sustained wholly independent in its criticisms, and always before party placing the *Church*. On no other principle would the writer of this article remain in his present position. He desires now to discharge a solemn duty by seeking the cause, and the remedy of our antagonisms. In such an inquiry he feels not the slightest regard for the interests of himself, or the criticisms of his adversaries. He has never in his editorial career written one single word of personal abuse, nor has he ever condescended to answer the falsehoods and misrepresentations with which he has been assailed. The noise of bloodless ecclesiastical battles has become a disregarded sound.

The general acquiescence in the provisions of the Canon amended by our last General Convention, shows that our differences do not originate in radical opposition to our Episcopal Order, and Apostolic Succession. Where the law of the Church is observed she cannot inquire into motives, or opinions. Nor would any view of the Holy Communion clearly distinguished from the monstrous absurdity of Transubstantiation seriously invade our peace. The root of our difficulties began in errors touching Baptism which seemed to assail that great central truth of the Christian system, and the Christian life which Saint Paul taught, and for which our Reformers died—the Justification of every penitent believer by Faith in the Righteousness of our atoning Lord regarded as expiating sin by His death upon the Cross.

The Scriptures constantly inculcate Faith, and Baptism, never exhibiting a suspicion of their antagonism. Both Greek, and Latin Fathers innocently follow their Lord, and His Apostles without dreaming that they taught hostile dogmas. The Reformers who expurgated our Liturgies, and compiled our Prayer Book were evidently under the same charming hallucination. We propose to quote at length the opinions of our standard Anglican Divines

showing how they followed undoubtingly in the path traced by the Church during so many centuries.

BAPTISM.

Bishop Jewell.

"Such a change is made in the Sacrament of Baptism. Through the power of God's working the water is turned into blood. They that be washed in it receive the remission of their sins; their robes are made clean in the blood of the Lamb. By the authority thus of many ancient Fathers it is plain that, in the Sacrament of Baptism, by the sensible sign of the water, the invisible grace of God is given to us."

Hooker.

"Yet the grace which is given them with their Baptism, doth so far forth depend on the very outward Sacrament, that God will have it embraced not only as a sign, or token of what we receive, but also an instrument or means by which we receive grace, because Baptism is a Sacrament which God has instituted in His Church to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated with Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life."

Bishop Andrews.

"St. Paul tells that besides the circumcision that was the manufacture, there was another made without hands. This is so in Baptism; besides the hand seen that casts on the water, the virtue of the Holy Ghost is there."

Donne.

"The water of Baptism is the water that runs through all the Fathers. Therefore Tertullian makes the water the progress and the settled house, the voyage and the harbor, the circumference and centre of the Holy Ghost. And therefore St. Hierom calls these waters the mother of the world—to foreshadow that the water also should bring forth the Church—that the Church of God should be born in the Sacrament of Baptism."

Dr. Jackson.

"It is then unsound and imperfect doctrine that original sin only is taken away, or remitted by Baptism, for whatsoever sins are remitted, or taken away by Christ's death, the same sins are in the same manner remitted, or taken away by Baptism into His death. Actual sins are remitted in such as are guilty of actual sins when they are baptized, though original sin be actually remitted in those which are not guilty of actual sins as in infants."

Dr. Barrow.

"It hath been the doctrine constantly, and with consent delivered in the Catholic Church that on all persons by the Holy Mystery of Baptism initia-

to Christianity, or admitted into the communion of Christ's Body, the e of God's Holy Spirit certainly is bestowed, enabling them to perform conditions of piety and virtue then undertaken by them."

ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL.

We distinguish between the visible sign, and the invisible grace; be- n the exterior sacramental ablution and the grace of the Sacrament, that terior regeneration. We believe that whosoever hath the former hath latter also, so that he doth not put a hand to that sacrament by his infi- y, or by processes of which a child is not capable."

THORNDIKE.

Yet is this no more than the regeneration of infants by water and the y Ghost imparteth; that the Spirit of God should be habitually present ake those reasons which God hath given to convince the world, that they it to be Christians, both discernible to the understanding, and weigh- down the choice.

BISHOP PEARSON.

It is certain that the forgiveness of sins was promised to all who were ized in the name of Christ, and it cannot be doubted but all persons who perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of baptism, also receive the benefit of the ordinance, which is remission of sins."

BISHOP BULL.

As if he had said, 'You have now God be thanked, escaped the pollu- s of the world, and are truly, I hope converted to Christianity, and in tism have been regenerated by the Holy Ghost,' that he means by their g made partakers of the Divine Nature."

BISHOP KEN.

Glory be to Thee, O most indulgent Love, who in our Baptism didst us the Holy Spirit of Love, to be the principle of new life, and love in o infuse into our souls a preternatural and habitual grace to obey and Thee."

COMBER.

ur praises must look back upon the grace already shown, and the bene- which are already given, which are principally two. 1. Internally, it is nerated. 2. Externally, it is grafted into Christ's Church."

BISHOP PATRICK.

Baptism, is the Sacrament of the new birth,—hereby He grants us remis- n of sin, and we are sanctified, and set apart to His use."

BISHOP SHERLOCK.

'By baptism we are declared to be such sons of God in whom He will ight, and whom He will appoint to be heirs of His kingdom. By Baptism receive the promise of His Spirit, by which we can cry 'Abba Father."

BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

"But that we may be thus born of the Spirit we must be born of water, which our Saviour hath put in the first place, not as if there were any such virtue in water whereby it would regenerate, but because this is the rite or ordinance appointed by Christ wherein to regenerate by the Holy Ghost."

WATERLAND.

"The second is the case of infants. Their innocence and incapacity are to them instead of repentance, which they do not need, and of actual faith which they cannot have. They are capable of being savingly born of water and the Spirit, and of being adopted in sonship with what depends thereon."

BISHOP WILSON.

"The Holy Spirit at Baptism takes possession of us, and keeps possession till men grieve Him."

BISHOP HORNE.

"The first portion of sanctifying grace is given at Baptism, which is the seal of justification, and the beginning of sanctification, inasmuch as the sinner being thus sacramentally buried with Christ in His death arises with Him in the power of His resurrection, justified from the guilt of sin, through repentance and faith in His blood, and renewed into holiness by the operation of His Holy Spirit."

BISHOP HEBER.

"Justification, is the same with that regeneration of which Baptism is the outward symbol, and which marks out whenever it occurs—that it ordinarily occurs in Baptism I am for my part firmly persuaded—our admission into the number of the children of God, and the heirs of everlasting happiness."

BISHOP MANT.

"It should appear I say that He was here alluding by anticipation to that Sacrament of Baptism which He intended to ordain, and that supernatural grace, which was thereby to be confirmed through the instrumentality of water and by the Holy Ghost."

BISHOP JEBB.

"It is enough for us to believe and cherish the prevailing sentiment of the Universal Church, as it has been maintained from the age of the Apostles, that at the time of Baptism a new nature is divinely communicated, and gracious privileges are especially vouchsafed."

Here then we have the consensus of the Anglican Divines in regard to the Sacrament of Baptism. It will be seen also that they profess everywhere to interpret the Scriptures, and the Greek and Latin Fathers as expressing the uniform testimony of the Catholic Church. Their opinions are simply embodied and concentrated in our own Articles and Offices. All apparent contradictions and incon-

gruities seem removed by considering the substance of their teachings. 1. That Baptism in the case of infants is Regeneration, and removes the guilt of original sin. 2. That Baptism in the case of penitent adults is the sacramental sign of their New Birth, and their Forgiveness. 3. That Baptism is always regarded by the Church as an incorporation into the Kingdom of God. 4. That while Baptism is in this sense, the beginning of the Spiritual life, in the usual order of God's government, there are exceptional instances where it is not essential to Salvation. And here we believe, that all true members of the American Church could sufficiently unite in practical harmony had not disturbing elements been introduced hereafter to be noticed. Before proceeding to their consideration we will show how the Anglican writers express themselves in regard to that Faith which to the believing penitent is the sole indispensable condition of his Justification.

Archbishop Cranmer.

"By faith we be justified before God—for faith maketh us partakers of the justice of Christ, and planteth us in Christ—and he that by true faith doth receive the promise of grace, to him God giveth the Holy Ghost, by which charity is spread abroad in our hearts which performeth all the commandments."

Bishop Hooper.

"St. Paul when he saith we be justified by faith, meaneth that we have remission of sin, and are accepted into the favor of God by the merits of Christ."

Bishop Latimer.

"Wherefore we must be justified, not through our good works, but through the passion of Christ, and so live by a free justification and righteousness in Christ Jesus. Whosoever thus *believeth*, mistrusting himself and his own doings, and trusting in the merits of Christ, he shall get the victory over death, the devil, and hell."

William Perkins.

"A man is justified by faith alone, because faith is that alone instrument, created in the heart by the Holy Ghost, whereby a sinner layeth hold of Christ's righteousness, and applieth the same unto himself. There is neither hope, nor love, nor any grace of God within man, that can do this, but faith alone."

Hooker.

"This then is the sum of that which I say; Faith doth justify; justification washes away sin; sin removed, we are clothed with the righteousness

which is in God: the righteousness of God makes us most holy. Every one of these I have proved by the testimony of God's own mouth; therefore I conclude that faith is that which makes us most holy, in consideration whereof it is called in this place our most holy faith."

DR. JACKSON.

"Now the particular object of our faith, of that faith by which sins are remitted, whether by Baptism, or otherwise, is not our general belief in Christ! even our belief in Christ dying for us in particular will not suffice, unless it included our belief of the everlasting virtue of His Bloody Sacrifice, and of His everlasting Priesthood for purifying, and cleansing our souls."

BISHOP ANDREWS.

"I know Saint Paul saith much; That our Saviour Christ shed His blood to show His righteousness, that He might not only be just but a justifier of those that are of His faith." "As from the Brazen Serpent no virtue issued to heal, but unto them that steadily beheld it, so neither do these from Christ, but upon those that with the eye of faith have their contemplation on this object, who thereby draw life from Him."

ARCHBISHOP USHER.

"But how is the great benefit of Justification applied unto us, and apprehended by us? This is done on our part by faith alone, and that not considered as a virtue inherent in us working by love, but only as an instrument, or hand of the soul stretched forth to lay hold on the Lord our Righteousness. So that faith justifieth only relatively in respect to the object, which it fasteneth on, to wit, the Righteousness of Christ, by which we are justified. Faith being only the instrument to convey so great benefit unto the soul."

BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

"And seeing the merit of Christ is made over unto us by our faith in Him, we are therefore said to be justified by faith, not as it is an act in us, but as it applies Christ to us. We are therefore said to be justified by faith in Christ, because we should not be justified by Christ without faith; wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely expressed in the Homily on Justification."

BISHOP HOPKINS.

"Justification is a gracious act of God whereby through the Righteousness of Christ's satisfaction imputed, He fully remits to the believing sinner the guilt and punishment of his sins, and through the Righteousness of Christ's perfect obedience imputed, He accounts him righteous and accepts him in love and favor, and unto eternal life. THIS IS JUSTIFICATION, WHICH IS THE VERY SUM AND PITH OF THE WHOLE GOSPEL, AND THE ONLY END OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE."

Thus we see how the consensus of the Anglican Divines is in accordance with the teachings of St. Paul, with the Greek and Latin

athers, and the Homilies and Articles of our Church. We are re plainly shown that whoever truly repents through the grace the Holy Ghost, and by Faith trusts in the atoning death of r Lord Jesus Christ, receives the remission of his sins styled stification, and an adoption among the children of God. Faith one justifies, although the faith which justifies is not alone. ith the pardon of sin is always associated that renewal of the oly Ghost which leads to filial love, sincere submission, and eerful obedience. Faith, being the principle of holiness instead making void, establishes the law. And this is taught by the ry venerable writers who inculcate that Baptism is a Sacrament Regeneration.

But we proceed one step further. The most reliable Anglican vines also inculcate that the faith of Justification may be acmpanied by a direct attestation of the Holy Ghost. If this is t a necessary attainment of the Christian Life it is at least repsented as a privilege of the Christian Life. We are now stating cts, without any minute analysis of theories.

Attestation.

Bishop Andrews.

'It is the proper effect of the love of Christ to cleanse our consciences m dead works to serve the living God, which, if we find it doth, Christ is ne to us as He is to come, and the Spirit is come, and puts His Teste, and we have His Teste we may go our way in peace; we have kept a right st unto Him, and to the memory of His coming. Even so come Lord sus, and come, O blessed Spirit, and bear witness to our spirit that rist's water, and His blood, we have ever part in both; both in the foun- n opened for sin and uncleanness, and in the blood of the New Testament, legacy whereof is everlasting life in the kingdom of glory."

Hooker.

'Unto you, because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His n into your hearts to the end that ye might *know* that Christ hath built n on a rock immovable, and He hath registered your names in the Book Life."

Bishop Brownrigg.

'This is one great office of the Holy Ghost to ratify and seal up to us the giveness of our sins."

Bishop Pearson.

"It is the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of sons, to

create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us the earnest of our everlasting inheritance. As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from Him our regeneration, so are we assured by the same Spirit of our adoption."

DR. BARROW.

"This is that Spirit of adoption which constituteth us the sons of God, qualifying us so to be by dispositions resembling God, and filial affections towards Him; certifying us that we are so, and causing us by a free instinct to cry, Abba, Father! running into His bosom of love, and flying under the wings of His mercy in all our needs, and distresses."

Certainly with such interpretations to our Prayer Book Anglican doctrine should not be misunderstood. Hooker more than any other single writer is the accepted exponent of the English Church. Does he in the immortal argument of his "Ecclesiastical Polity," demonstrate an Apostolic Episcopate perpetuated in an Apostolic Succession? Does he show from Holy Scripture and Ancient Fathers the institution of our ministerial order? Does he exhibit Baptism as the usual beginning, and the Eucharist as the principal perpetuation of the Divine Life? He, with the long unbroken line of the most profound, and venerated Scholars, and Doctors, and Bishops, testifies with equal distinctness to the truth of Justification by Faith, and of the assurance of Salvation precisely as set forth by the greatest Protestant writers without our Communion. Here the sincere Presbyterian, or Methodist would be willing to accept the instructions of Andrews, or Hooker, or Pearson, or Barrow. Thus every Churchman standing firmly, and forever by his Ordinal and his Sacramental Offices, is bound in heart and doctrine and experience to millions of noble spirits in all parts of Christendom. He may be true to every rubric, and every observance, and every inculcation of his Prayer Book; and have as the centre of his spiritual being that very doctrine of Justification by faith with which Luther shook Rome, and which Calvin so zealously defended, and to which Protestantism clings at this hour as the hope of the individual and of the world. Nay, the completeness of his character and the harmony of his life depend on uniting what God has joined, and party has divided. Less than fifty years since unity on these points was our perpetual boast and glory. Our past differences seem so slight in the retrospect compared with our present divergence, that, like parallel lines, prolonged before the eye, they fade into each other. What then has caused our de-

plorable extremes? We have no hesitation in saying they had their chief origin in connection with the Tractarian Movement. To make this plain we must trace the events which gave it birth.

After the Reformation had established the Anglican Church substantially in its present form, its entanglements with the State were continually impeding its spiritual development. Elizabeth seems always to have been wavering in her attachment, and vacillating in her opinions, and was more anxious for a hierarchy to assist her government than a religion to save her soul. The subsequent reigns of the century marked by ecclesiastical exaction and puritanical intolerance, and royal dissoluteness and jesuitical falsehood, and dutch contempt, although abounding in instances of beautiful piety, and brilliant eloquence, and profound learning, certainly did not accomplish much in promoting the faith, or improving the morals of the English nation. During the earlier periods of the Hanoverian dynasty, skepticism was rather the rule than the exception among nobles, and scholars, and people. The gigantic and unparalleled labors of Wesley and Whitefield arrested the headlong ruin. Well would it have been for the Church had her Bishops legalized the eccentricities of such zeal, and piety and genius. But the Apostle of this reform renounced his belief in the Episcopacy as a divine institution, and by an unwarantable ordination prepared an inevitable schism. Besides, the mighty preachers of the Methodist Reform in their zeal for faith and experience, overlooked order and observance. They raised up around them many clergymen of the establishment who became itinerant evangelists, hostile to the catholicity of the Church, and only sympathizing with its Protestantism. In the other extreme were Bishops nominated by godless Ministers, and Rectors appointed by godless Lords, whose dissoluteness was a public scandal. Can it be wonderful that worldliness and enthusiasm should together have devastated the Church? Its Order was too often despised. Its Sacraments were neglected. Its Fasts and Feasts were unobserved. Its cathedrals were deserted and decayed. Faith, Doctrine, Piety, exhibited together a sisterhood of suffering. Noble spirits in the nineteenth century rushed to the rescue, as noble spirits had been called forth in the eighteenth century. Oxford was the birth-place of two movements impelled by precisely opposite poles of influence. One was to revive Faith: the other

was to revive Order. One was to promote experience; the other was to promote observance. One was to overthrow the Apostolical Succession, and the other was to inspire reverence for its claims. One was to depreciate, and the other was to elevate Sacraments. One was the necessity and the complement of the other. And it is perfectly certain that Tractarianism in its early stages never contemplated any alliance with Rome. Indeed, it boasted itself the "via media." It asserted that

"Methodism and Popery are in different ways the refuge of those whom the Church stints of the gifts of grace;" and that "the Pope has encroached on the rights of the Churches."

How strangely now will sound to some of its grand-children, the opinion which we quote:

"Surely before the blessing of a millenium were vouchsafed to us, the whole Christian world has much to confess in its various branches. Rome has to confess her Papal corruptions, and her cruelty towards those who refuse to accept them. The Christian Communion of our own land, and Scotland, and other countries, their neglect of the Apostolical Order of ministers. THE GREEK CHURCH HAS TO CONFESS ITS SAINT-WORSHIP; its formal fasts; its want of zeal. The Church of Asia their heresy." "Luther, and his associates, upheld in the main the true doctrine, and though it is not necessary to defend every act of fallible men like them, yet we are fully justified in maintaining that the conduct of those who defended the truth against the Romish party, even in opposition to the spiritual rulers, is worthy of great praise." "I look upon our Articles as in one sense an addition to the Creeds, and at the same time the Romanists added their Tridentine Articles. Them I consider unsound—ours true." "I would have the Church do the same thing now, if I could; she should not *change the Articles;* she should add to them." "I further maintain that while I fully concur in the Articles as far as they go, they who call us Papists do not concur in the doctrine of the Liturgy."

It is thus demonstrable that the Tractarians at first simply aimed to revive the Catholic order and observance of the Church, but not to change her Protestant position. While they occupy this ground, and defend the received Anglican view of the Sacraments, it is marvelous with what point, and power and unction they write. Their words of flame kindled the Church over the world. But gradually their object shifts. They begin with a tame apology for the Anglican position. They speak with tolerance of some more innocent Romish practices. They depart from their Protestant attitude of stern, uncompromising, perpetual opposition to

Popish usurpations and corruptions. They end by an endeavor to reconcile English Articles and Tridentine Canons. When the barriers were thus cut away, of course a wavering multitude rushed over on the impetuous torrent. Rome has eagerly watched the wrecks, and borne away into her harbor with triumph the brightest genius of the century, and a zealous disciple who may yet be a Pope, and Clergymen almost numberless, and noblemen whose aggregated estates would support without exhaustion the splendor of the Vatican and the pageantry of St. Peter's. Now that the dogma of Infallibility presents an insurmountable barrier to reunion, it is seen that Eirenicons instead of promoting peace, have been multiplying perverts.

But after all the most startling departure remains to be noticed. We have seen the Anglican teaching in regard to Baptism and Faith. Some divines of the Oxford school, inculcated what was utterly alien to the standards of the English Church. One writer, approved by its acknowledged organ, maintained

"That our being reckoned righteous before God, always and essentially, implies a substance of righteousness previously implanted in us, and that our reputative justification is the strict and inseparable result of this previous efficient moral justification. I mean, that the reckoning us righteous indispensably presupposes an inward reality of righteousness on which this reckoning is founded." Mr. Newman writes: "Justification consists in God's inward presence. It is the act of God imparting His divine presence to the soul through Baptism, and so making us the temples of the Holy Ghost." "Christ is our righteousness by dwelling in us, and by His Spirit, justifies us by entering in us, and continues to justify by remaining in us."

Mr. Pusey does not seem, in his tract on Baptism, to have taught such views. Yet he certainly employed language different from the Anglican consensus, when he writes:

"In these events we are spoken of as *passive only;* we did nothing for ourselves; we *were* baptized, buried, planted, crucified; the very language marks that all this was God's doing in us and for us. We had no more to do with it than a man hath with burying or crucifying himself."

The atonement, too, was hailed as a mystery, only discernible by the delicate vision of the spiritual few, not proclaimed as a great fact, boldly and constantly before the world, as the only hope of the sinner. Man was, by some of these writers, sent for pardon to something wrought by grace in his own heart, and not to the Cross directly as his salvation. Surely it was to be ex-

pected that those who loved the Anglican Reformation, the Anglican Articles and the Anglican Divines, should be confounded and alarmed by such statements. The excitement and the opposition which ensued were inevitable. It was hard to draw a distinction between the views at least of Mr. Knox and Mr. Newman, and the Tridentine doctrine. It was impossible for many minds to perceive any essential divergence, in the extracts given, from the famous canon, declaring

"If any man shall say that the good works of a justified person are the gifts of God, in such a manner that they are not also the justified person's merits, in that the justified person does not truly deserve increase of grace and eternal life, and, upon condition that he die in the grace of God, the obtaining of eternal life, and also an increase of grace, by those good works which he does by the grace of God, and the merit of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member—let him be accursed."

We do not affirm that Tractarianism intended to teach the Roman error. Possibly its meaning was misconceived. But its views were astounding to those who had read the powerful words of Hooker in his Discourse on Justification, where he says:

"This is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread. When they speak of the first or second Justification, they make the essence a divine quality inherent; they make it righteousness which is in us. If it be in us, then it is ours, as our souls are ours, though we have them from God, and can hold them no longer than pleaseth Him; for, if He withdraw the breath of our nostrils we fall into dust. But the righteousness wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own. Therefore we cannot be justified by *any* inherent quality. The Church of Rome in teaching Justification by inherent grace, doth pervert the truth of Christ, and by the hands of the Apostles we have received otherwise than she teacheth."

That the Oxford divines designed to teach what their words appear to indicate, is certainly made more probable by a recent development. Keble is represented in his Biography by Sir John Coleridge, as contemptuously calling the doctrine of Justification by Faith a "tradition." At this distance of time, when passion has subsided, we can calmly contemplate this controversy. Without at all deciding what the extreme Tractarian school intended, it may be safely asserted that to send a penitent into his own heart for the comfort of pardon, is essential Popery. Such a direction subverts the very foundations of the Gospel. It overthrows the established distinction between Justification and Sanctification. It

points a man to himself, instead of the Cross. It confuses, by encouraging a subtle analysis of states and experiences. It disturbs peace, it discourages hope, it clouds joy by turning faith from that righteousness of our atoning Lord, which is our only refuge and our eternal glory. It tends to substitute a work in the creature for the merit of the Saviour. It weakens all the springs of the spiritual life. The penitent turned from Christ to himself, with a painful feeling of darkness, and languor and deficiency, is prepared to complete an acceptable righteousness by mere legal works. Here Rome has laid her foundations for penance, and confession, and indulgences; and saint-merit, saint-worship, and saint-mediation; and absolution, and purgatory, and mass: and a whole system of mediæval error which substitutes the Priest for our Saviour, and places at the disposal of man the salvation of God. We do not assert that this was at all contemplated by any Tractarians. But we do affirm, whatever was their meaning, that the language of some of their number was so entire a departure from the received Anglican interpretation of the Gospel, as recorded in Homilies, and Articles and Divines, that Churchmen had a right to feel alarm. They did feel alarm. Unfortunately that alarm assumed an organized form. Whatever effect Tractarianism temporarily produced, and however it may now be received by certain extremists, it has certainly not been adopted by the American Church. Justification by any infusion of grace, has never been taught in our General Theological Seminary. It is not inculcated by our standard Divines. It is not proclaimed in our prominent pulpits. The writer has heard the same doctrine from the eloquent Bishop of Ohio, which attracts within the walls of St. Thomas, and impresses beneath the arches of Old Trinity. His observation leads him to believe there is a substantial unity in regard to the great central truth of a sinner's justification in the different sections of the Church. Therefore it would seem to have been the wiser policy for Protestant Churchmen, justly alarmed, to have awaited the subsidence of passion, and to have used their influence within the legitimate agencies of the Church, and above all things, to have avoided making their differences permanent by organization. We can conceive nothing more unfortunate than any association instituted to perform any work in any instance where the Church has herself legislated; and by no other body in the world than our

own General Convention would such action for one moment be tolerated. Yet there was strong provocation, and such liberties have been for years overlooked. Every day we are reaping the terrible harvest from seeds dropped into the soil of the Church at a crisis of excusable and righteous apprehension.

We must, therefore, regard antagonistic organizations as a fact. The evil can now find its remedy not so much by violence, as by compromise. Is there any method by which this deadly cancer can be removed from the bosom of the Church? Until the disease is cured all her movements will be retarded, and her triumphs deferred.

It has been remarked that the doctrine of Baptismal Justification, which seems inferrable from some of the Oxford school, is not at present widely accepted in the American Church. Is there any other tangible evil which some loyal men trace to Tractarianism? However unjust their inference, the question must be affirmatively answered. Many philosophic minds consider Ritualism as the outgrowth of the Oxford Movement. It certainly finds a centre in Oxford University, and has supporters among Oxford Collegians. Now Ritualism has entrenched itself chiefly within a single citadel of this country. There, to this day, its banner floats in defiance of all law. Bishops have individually protested. The General Convention has mildly legislated. The United Episcopate has issued a noble address. Canon, argument and remonstrance have not availed. Around its American centre Ritualism has gathered an English literature teaching the invocation of Saints, priestly absolution, virtual transubstantiation, and a whole cluster of mediæval errors. We believe there can be no peace until that stronghold is demolished, not by the ordinary process of trial, but by the legislative action of the General Convention. There is something in the presentation of a Clergyman from which manly natures shrink. The part of a spy in seeking evidence which will convict, is invidious and detestable. Beside, the excitements of an ecclesiastical trial engender bitterness, and too often lower the dignity of the Church and injure the morals of society. The anomalous want of a Supreme Appellate Court also makes any particular decision merely local in its application, so that what may be law in one Diocese is offence in another. Moreover, there are always evasions by which the accused may escape

justice, and one of the most disastrous results of modern Ritualism is its tendency to conceal its Romish counterfeits and illegal practices. The very altar of God has witnessed subterfuges which seem far removed from the simplicity and directness of Christian integrity. Everything then points to a decided action on the part of our next General Convention. Its warnings and counsels have been unheeded. Let it now vindicate its dignity, and assert its authority by a resolution of absolute and perpetual suppression. We can conceive nothing more wise, and nothing more noble. If the Church has been misconstrued, if the mere opinions of individuals have been regarded as the doctrines of the majority, if there has been a hostile and schismatic system of Voluntaryism, let it be remembered that there was much to excite suspicion of departure from our Anglican standards; that there have been multiplied secessions to the Papacy, and that Ritualistic practices expressing Romish doctrine which have been pronounced illegal by the highest Courts of England, are still permitted in America against the united wishes of our Episcopate, and the known resolution of the General Convention. There is nothing so much as the action indicated that will heal wounds, allay suspicions, restore confidence, and harmonize all loyal men in the different sections of the Church. Indeed until we have a bold and unmistakable vindication of the majesty of law, carrying with it proof that our Catholic sympathies have not weakened our Protestant principles, there can never in this country be anything but war and humiliation.

Now suppose loyal Churchmen, from every quarter, unite in support of the measure we have advocated. Then can be approached the whole subject of Voluntaryism. The dignity of the General Convention indeed required the immediate suppression of every organization hostile to its own societies. It feared however to assert its power; nothing now remains but to deal with a permitted fact. Compromise and not compulsion, is the plain remedy. After the legislation described, a committee wisely composed of representative men would be prepared for the consideration of a measure of consolidation. Thus we might see once more all the contributions of the Church for the education of our ministry, the diffusion of religious knowledge, and the evangelization of the world, flow into the common treasury of our Master. Thus would

be avoided the scandal involved in the spectacle of men ordained by the same Episcopate, bound by the same vows, using the same Liturgy, subscribing the same Articles, and yet belonging to antagonistic organizations, one charging heresy, and the other charging schism. Thus would we escape those feelings of littleness and alienation caused by every parish collection, by every quarterly missionary celebration, and above all by those annual demonstrations which inflict so much pain, and excite so much opposition. Thus would we behold the entire Church united in the entire work of converting the entire world to our Lord. May not the accomplished union of the great religious bodies, receiving the same standards, yet alienated by years of strife, be a stimulus to our efforts in promoting harmony! Much more should we not recall the noble spectacle, so full of love, and majesty, when the northern and southern sections of the American Church became forever one in heart and organization, as they were one in Faith and Order!

And here we venture to suggest that our Baptismal Service, and our Articles, equally express the Anglican consensus. A change in the first by one section, will prepare for a change in the second by the other section. And are not alternative phrases, but authorized and perpetuated differences of opinion? What could be more unfortunate than to make a sacramental office a party badge? The Bishops who have lent their names to the movement which would terminate in a result so disastrous, have not followed their own wishes, but simply sought to relieve their troubled brethren. May we not therefore hope that the action of the General Convention we have before indicated in regard to Ritualism, would appease the disappointment to be caused by the inevitable denial of a request to alter the Baptismal Office, and thus prevent a threatened schism? Restored confidence would speedily dissipate all the lesser clouds of disaffection. Where love rules captiousness disappears.

There is certainly, however, a rising difficulty in another direction which yet our wisdom can overcome. We have seen all visions of intercommunion with Rome scattered by the declaration of Papal Infallibility. Few of even the most extreme will be so blinded by schemes of impossible unity as to admit a changeless dogma which virtually makes a mortal God; which chains the

world to the Vatican; which constitutes the representative of St. Peter not only an unerring oracle, but a universal sovereign; which sanctifies error, justifies persecution, and stamps with truth and justice, and charity the enormities of more than ten centuries. Just, however, in proportion to our disappointment in regard to the Latin Church will the current rush with increased violence towards the Greek Church. Here, we believe, that the conservative wisdom of our General Convention will be exhibited. May we not, however, suggest that without internal unity the desire for external unity is vain? How can a divided household preach reconciliation? How can warring men proclaim peace? How can those unreconciled in the same communion bend all their efforts to harmonize different communions? Our first, our greatest, our noblest aim, should be concord among ourselves. Christian brethren must promote love more by example than by words. Let our chief aim be peace at home. There are men in our midst from both parties who believe that the protests of our Articles against idolatry and transubstantiation, apply equally to the Greek and Latin Churches; and who, like their ancestors, would resist every effort towards compromise, conceding a single position for which our Fathers shed their blood. There can never be communion except on the basis of Reformation. Mere words are nothing. Measures towards unity, unless meaningless, must pass into action. If the questions of Order and the Creed were adjusted, the Oriental Liturgies must be absolutely purified, before the services of our Churches can be interchangeable. Will an Anglican priest kiss the icons? Will a Greek priest abstain from kissing the icons? Will an Anglican priest invoke the Virgin? Will a Greek priest abstain from invoking the Virgin? Will an Anglican priest worship the host? Will a Greek priest abstain from worshiping the host? Surely here are difficulties at present insurmountable. When we consider that before there can be any practical intercommunion, all the views of the Eastern Church in regard to Orders must be abandoned; when we consider that both the English Church and the American Church will have to make an important change in the Nicene Creed; when we consider that all the Oriental Liturgies must be expurgated, we may well hesitate to produce greater alienation at home by chasing visions of unity abroad. Surely our losses through our Romish dreams, finally

terminated by the barrier of Infallibility, should be a lesson of warning. We are told already that Greek priests in England and America are preparing to establish Parishes, and gather our wavering sheep. Let us remember that while on our side Assemblies and Conventions and Convocations have been passionate in their advances, on the other side there has been nothing but the fraternal expressions of individual Prelates, conceding no principle, and intended to concede no principle. Let us seek for unity. Let us pray for unity. But let it be unity on the principles of that English Reformation which restored to the world the purity of the Apostolic Church, untarnished in its Faith, and unbroken in its Order, and therefore to be at last the hope, and light, and glory of Christendom!

Before closing our Article we are compelled to admit, that if the recent decision of the Court of Arches in the case of Mr. Bennet should be sustained by the Privy Council, and widely adopted by the American Church, the difficulties in the way of peace would be endlessly complicated. Let us inquire for a moment what is tolerated by the English Ecclesiastical Law, according to the decision of Sir Robert Phillimore as a judge, and what is believed by him as an individual. Admit that by the word of a Priest there is with the elements on the altar a localized, exterior, objective Presence of our Lord. For what is it there? To be adored? But, both by its genius, and its institution, *participation*, not worship, is the object of the Holy Eucharist. The recipient, with the bread and wine, must *feed* on the Body and Blood of Christ. How? Through his lips? Then physical organs must masticate spiritual aliment. The material takes, eats, digests the intangible, the invisible, the impalpable. This is absurd. Therefore the reception must be by Faith. This, however, is interior. This acts within the soul, and not without. This cannot go out to apprehend the objective, and exterior. Hence Christ enters the "*heart*," where we "feed on Him," "with thanksgiving." Hence our Article says, "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, *only* after a *heavenly* and *spiritual* manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten is *Faith*." Hence in our Catechism we teach the same doctrine to our very children. We confess that if our choice was between the Objective Presence of Mr. Cobb and the Transubstantiation of

Trent, we should prefer the latter. The old Roman manducation is a single act. The new Anglican manducation perplexes by the double operation of receiving through the lips, at the same time, a physical and a spiritual substance, while it utterly confounds the office of the mouth and the office of the faith. There can, therefore, be no possible reason why the Body and Blood of our Saviour should be locally on the altar, unless Sacrifice and Adoration are the chief objects of the Holy Eucharist. On the contrary, *participation* is the characteristic of the mystery.

Perhaps the readers of this REVIEW have, within this year, noticed Essays entitled "Advanced Ritualism," "The Liturgy, and The Articles," and "The Greek Church." They were not written without design, without care, or without consultation. They are believed to embody true Anglican principles. They seek to express the harmony of the Catholic and the Protestant elements of the Church. They would present a basis on which loyal men of all parties may stand in defence of Truth. To sustain his course the Editor appeals to the sense and piety of true men in every section of the Church. Nor does he doubt the final triumph of the great principles he deems it the highest privilege of his life to vindicate. He would adopt as a motto—INTERNAL UNITY ON THE BASIS OF BOTH OUR CATHOLICITY AND OUR PROTESTANTISM: EXTERNAL UNITY ONLY ON THE BASIS OF A GREEK AND LATIN REFORMATION.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Its History, Principles, and Results. A. D.* 1514, 1547. *By the* REV. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M. A. F. S. A.; *Vicar of Kennington, Oxford; Editor of the "Annotated Book of Common Prayer;" Author of "Directorium Pastorale," etc. Rivingtons, London, Oxford and Cambridge. Pott & Amery, New York,* 1870.

We have always supposed that the real basis of the Roman Theology is its inculcation touching the merit of the creature. It gathers and concentrates itself in the Tridentine Canon on Justification, quoted in the last Article of our present number. Hence the whole structure of works of supererogation and the mediation of Saints. Both Continental and Anglican Reformers assailed the vast and central error of Rome by the doctrine of a sinner's Justification by Faith as taught by St. Paul. This sweeps away at a stroke hoary dogmas and practices which enchained and blinded Christendom for ages. The soul, suddenly aroused from centuries of superstition and stupor, hungered and thirsted for Divine Truth, and nothing in the Reformation is more marvelous than the avidity with which the people read the translated Scriptures, and received the revived teaching in regard to Faith. These mighty spiritual impulses were most characteristic of the era, and while in Germany they frequently burst forth into a wild fanaticism, in England they were subdued and controlled, and finally pervaded and shaped the whole theology of the Anglican Divines. The boast and glory of our Fathers have always been that they restored the great doctrine of Justification by Faith to its place in the Christian system, and at the same time preserved the Apostolic Order in its integrity and the Primitive Sacraments in their purity. Have we been dreaming? Have we totally misunderstood our English standards? Have we utterly misconceived the Anglican Divines? If Mr. Blunt is correct in his history, we acknowledge a hopeless deficiency in ordinary understanding. He entirely ignores the doctrinal work of the Reformation, and proposes the scheme of Wolsey as furnishing its truest model. That the Cardinal has been misunderstood and misrepresented, we heartily concede. He was certainly a man of masterly genius, and kind heart, far in advance of his age, and moving in a world infinitely higher than that of the narrow priests and politicians by whom he was surrounded. If his ambition was large, it was magnificent, and while seeking brilliancy for his own fame, he contemplated vast benefit for his nation. But should we accept his plan of Reform as an ultimatum, Romanism at this hour would be the religion of Britain. The history of Mr. Blunt is simply designed so to exalt the Catholic element of the Church of England as forever to obliterate its Protestantism. To accept its theories is to deny the great central truths for which our Fathers battled and died. We will let our author speak for himself.

"That which we shall thus gather it will be convenient to state in a summary form at the outset, and supposing that Wolsey had, in the early part of his public life, formed a complete and definite plan of his intentions as to the Reformation of the Church of England, we might imagine him to have condensed them into the following plan:

1. To provide a better educated class of clergy by founding Professorships at the Universities, by building new Colleges, and by establishing Schools similar to Winchester and Eton as feeders for them.

2. To have a general visitation of the Clergy and the monks by a central and supreme authority, which could not be resisted for the purpose of restoring sound discipline as to morals, and for enforcing strict performance of duties.

3. To found new Bishoprics in the large towns, out of the great monasteries already existing there.

4. To conciliate the King, the old-fashioned Bishops, and the obstructive party generally, by opposing the importation of foreign elements, such as Lutheranism, into the Universities or elsewhere.

5. To practice toleration as far as possible towards hot-headed Reformers, and to give employment in the new Colleges to the best and most learned of them.

6. To promote theological learning by encouraging the study of the Greek, and by enriching the libraries of the Universities.

7. To obtain the fullest authority possible from the Pope, and the King, for carrying out these reforms, and to seek the Popedom itself that they might be extended to the Church at large.

The splendor of this noble programme is not lessened by the consideration that it was very unlikely Wolsey would form so full and definite a plan at the outset of his career. Even if we extend it over fifteen years, from 1514 to 1529, and allow that it formed only a portion of the great schemes which passed through the brain of one who was far the greatest political ruler England had yet seen, *we must still acknowledge that it was the most comprehensive view of Church reform that was ever contemplated, and one before which the actual Reformation shrinks into a confused mass of half-accomplished good and unobstructed evil.*"

When we remember that Wolsey was always a loyal son of Rome, who never renounced a single iota of her superstitious dogmas, the words we have italicised certainly seem astounding. After such a statement we do not wonder that Mr. Blunt accepts as the doctrine of the Church of England the Faith of the Ten Articles issued in the mere twilight of the Reformation. We will quote a portion of it and add his remarks:

"Under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really contained, and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered on the Cross for our redemption, and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very self-same body and blood of Christ is *corporally, really* and in *substance* exhibited, distributed, and received of all them which receive the Sacrament."

"It will be observed that this is a full and firm assertion of the doctrine of the Real Presence as it is, and always has been held by High-Church Divines in the Church of England."

If this assertion were true we would advocate another Reformation. Thank Heaven that we have reason to believe such a view has not been widely adopted in America!

THE LAY READER. *A Series of Sermons for the Christian Year. By* JOHN N. NORTON, *Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky., &c. Philadelphia, Richard McCauley*, 1314 *Chestnut St.*, 1870.

We took up these sermons in our ignorance of their author, with very meagre expectations, and we laid them down with the certainty that they are very admirable. They are not scholarly, elaborate or rounded discourses: but they are plain, concrete, pointed, hitting squarely some mark, and the very opposite of what we call dull. We should never expect to find Mr. Norton's parish Church a comfortable place for a Sunday's nap, and he must be a living man speaking living words that rouse men from the death of trespasses and sins. These sermons which have in them a certain American flavor of Western origin, we commend as lively expressions of some of the most lively truths of the word of God.

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY. *By* WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., *&c. Eighth Edition. New York, Charles Scribner & Co.*, 654 *Broadway*, 1870.

The substance of this book consists of lectures delivered in Auburn Theological Seminary in 1852-3, and like every thing which passes out of the author's brain into print is grave, and full of plain Saxon sense. As its name implies, this is a volume of instruction about the very ancient, difficult and still disputed mâtter of sermonizing. In general what it says about this art is sensible and sometimes far-sighted and profound. The conscientious man skilled in such subtle work—the man who regards the preaching of the Word as the first of arts, where one speaking rightly of God, knows his eloquence to need, above all, the grace of God in him who speaks and him who hears, and therefore writes as it were upon his knees before his God, words earnest and full of the flavor of his own soul,—will find in Professor Shedd's advice to theological students many things which his own experience has taught him. And though every true preacher must after all go his own way to his own work, there are many things in this book which any sacred orator might read with thanks, and find of use. In the Chapter on "The nature and choice of a text," there are some rare bits of what we may call the humorous side of texts in their application, as for instance when one Englishman preached from Acts xvi. 30, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" a sermon on the divine right of Episcopacy. Since St. Paul and Silas are called "Sirs" and "Sirs" being in the Greek κύριοι, meaning "Lords," it is perfectly plain that at that time Episcopacy was not only the acknowledged government, but bishops were peers of the realm and so ought to sit in the House of Lords. Another preached in King Charles II's time from the text "Seek first the kingdom of God" a sermon to show that a king's government is most in accordance with the will of God. "For said the preacher, it is not said seek the *parliament* of God, the *army* of God, or the *Committee of Safety* of God, but it is Seek the *Kingdom* of God."

The part of the Professor's book on Pastoral Theology, discloses a reverent Puritan mind, toned and softened in the atmosphere of the XIXth Century.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. *By* WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., &c. *Vols. I. & II. Third Edition. New York, Charles Scribner & Co.* 654 *Broadway*, 1870.

Whatever Prof Shedd writes is sure to be treated with great respect by very thinker in the realm of philosophy and religion, even by those most questioning his conclusions, since he is a man sincere, of sound learning and metaphysical acumen, who years ago in his Edition of Coleridge's works howed what stuff was in him. As a Churchman, we can never understand ow to the Puritan, or man who disbelieves Christ's Church to be an historic, organic and ever living whole—as a tree putting out diverse branches, osing some, others being dead, yet the same tree nevertheless—but holds that he Church is to reproduce itself everywhere in isolated congregations—there an be any true or connected Church history at all. Yet our Puritan friends and the Professor is one), often show great industry in Ecclesiastical studies —as these volumes prove.

From vol. I. after laying down the principles of his science, he discusses he influences of heathen and mediæval philosophers on Christianity down o this age: the history of the attack and defence of the Faith, as between eretics and Catholics; and above all the Trinitarianism of the Church, oth before and after Nicea, in its influence on the mind and life of the Faithful. In vol. II. he tells the story of the other great Church ideas, embraced in the words Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. The field s wide and rich, but often examined, and the Rev. Doctor, if he has said othing really new, has so at least arranged and marshalled old facts, that is students may get a very clear idea of the development of Christian doctrine. And as far as most men may, standing outside an historic Church, our uthor has grasped firmly on their intellectual side the great questions of Humanity and God, which have served so long as exercises for scholars, and re the deep foundations of the faith of the millions. We know of no recent theological work this side the water, which shows more grasp and research, and is more clearly cut and shaped than this.

CHRISTIANITY AND GREEK PHILOSOPHY, *Or the Relation between spontaneous and reflective Thought in Greece, and the positive Teaching of Christ and His Apostles. By* B. F. COCKER, D.D., *Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. New York, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square.* 1870.

A thick book of 531 pages filled full of hard, keen thought about the deepst questions, touching man by nature and by Grace, and especially as e shows himself in the Classic Hellenic garb of Plato and Socrates, may erve as an outside description of a book creditable in many ways to American hought and literature. A clear-headed, patiently-searching, scholarly man rote it. Its title explains its purpose well enough. In his inquiry into the elations of Greek philosophy to Christianity which he prefaces with that uotation from St. Augustine, "Plato made us know the true God, Jesus Christ showed us the way to Him," an inquiry as all may see down among he very roots of human thought, he shows us many singular things con-

cerning that "fullness of time," of which Scripture speaks, and the preparation of the world for the Incarnation. Heathen philosophy, *in* Greece and *from* Greece was ever asearch after God; and the men who came nearest to finding Him, were, as we think, Socrates and Plato; and still they found Him only behind veils and clouds, but never upon a Cross. The prime defect of all the Greek philosophies was in their inability to satisfy the broken law of God. That God should sacrifice His Son, was entirely beyond their reach. The true fullness that filled even the Divine Law to satisfy it was in Jesus Christ.

It only remains to say that it is one of the singular qualities of this work that it was written by a resident of our West, in a State which forty years ago was a howling wilderness. Since Plato speaks even on the prairie, what news shall we not sooner or later hear from that quarter? The politicians are saying that the West is soon to be the centre of political power. However that may be, every now and then a new book born in that region makes its way in upon us, and we confess they show something, as in this book, which impresses us with a sense of the coming greatness of the West even in literature, and that somewhere, under the shadows of the Rocky Mountains and by her great rivers the so called West of these United States is to become the home of a great cultured and artistic civilization.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRISON ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK. *For the year* 1869.

We know of no humane book published in a twelvemonth, more interesting to the Christian and the philanthropist than this. Dr. Wines, the Secretary of the Association, has made it a Year Book of Prison scenes; and these Reports as they continue will soon form an Encyclopedia of information touching our prisons. Both here and in Europe able and devoted men have written for this annual, the best and wisest things. The readers of the Church Review may pass by these lines without notice, but they are written down to declare as provable beyond dispute, that the American prison system is already a vast interest of money and morality, and must become more so; that it is to the last degree unscientific and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it costs more than it should and is vastly behind doing all the good that it ought; that to-day it is the great shame and evil in our American institutions despite all the labors of Prison Associations; that it needs and will have a reformation; that it must be taken utterly out of politics, and put on a scientific basis; and that the way to do this great work is to rouse the American people to its necessity, and then put it in the hands of just such men as the members of the Prison Association of New York, and let them in the name of Humanity and God deliver us from a system that destroys the prisoner and burdens the citizen with debt.

We stand ready to show any Bishop of this Church a new opening for church work in connection with prisons, which cannot but be acceptable to Him who has spoken it for our behoof—"I was sick and in prison, and ye came unto me."

THE NATIONS AROUND. *By* A. KEARY. *Author of "Early Egyptian History." Macmillan & Co., Publishers.* 1870.

"The Nations Around" turns out to be a history of the singular customs and manners of those ancient heathen races, the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Chaldeans, and the like who dwelt *around* the Jews from the early ages, and toned the Hebrew national life in many ways. It therefore illustrates many passages in Holy Writ, and as it was written for a Christian's reading on Sundays, so God's Word has often a more intelligent meaning for those who are acquainted with Mr. Keary's pages. He shows himself to be widely learned in ancient lore, and to have the power of throwing away all useless lumber and building with an artist's skill out of choice material a beautiful house of history wherein everything is bright, clear and shining. There are other books, like Wilkinson's and Layard's, that contain more details of Egyptian and Chaldean history, but we know of no book that on these subjects as related to God's Word, contains so much real wheat of instruction, or is so valuable to the general Christian reader. It is published in exquisite taste, and we hereby without fear of wise contradiction commend it to all parents for themselves and children. It is reading for any day, and ought to be in every library.

THE THREEFOLD GRACE OF THE HOLY TRINITY. *By* JOHN H. EGAR, B. D. *Rector of St. Peter's Church, Pittsburgh, Pa. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.* 1870.

It lies within the range of criticism, and not against personal courtesy to say, that the writer of this book is of Western strain and culture, and has been for some time known to many to be of a far-reaching and subtile mind fit as human nature reverently may, to reach out after some of the most recondite matters of our Holy Faith. What he attempts in this work may be seen well enough in these extracts from it. Our knowledge of God is not knowledge of Him in Himself apart from us, but knowledge of Him in relation to us. Our faith in the Holy Trinity is the highest reach of thought, above which it cannot ascend into a philosophy of the Absolute, such as has been vainly imagined possible; it is rather the starting point from which reason may descend to the world and to ourselves. (p. 43.)

"The work of Redemption is a complex operation of the Three Divine Persons, in which each bears his own distinctive part. There is an operation of the Father, an operation of the Son distinct from that of the Father, and an operation of the Holy Ghost distinct from those of the Father and the Son. The knowledge that these operations are effectually performed in us to our salvation, gives us the only well-grounded comfort and Christian joy." p. 46.

It is true that this book is able, subtile, and puts old truth into a fresh and available form, so that the thoughtful Christian mind will be quickened in its faith by these new utterances; and it is no mean contribution to American theology, having a certain ripeness and patience in it evidently won from the study of the blessed Patriarchs and Fathers. But while we confess so much in its praise, this book reminds us forcibly of the inevitable limita-

tion and defect of all such writings. For if it took the whole Church in the Nicene Council to define what the Trinity *is*, and even St. Athanasius could confess "although it is impossible to comprehend what God is, yet it is possible to say what He is not," it must take a very clever person to say what this same Trinity *does;* and when we consider that Mr. Egar regards the Trinity, as a mystery, and proceeds to show how each of its Persons, in themselves mysteries, acts upon the human mind, itself an invisible and startling mystery, it is not surprising if he fails to explain his alleged spiritual phenomena so as to place his thesis above all contradiction. We have never seen the simple Fact of God *proved* by any metaphysician or philosopher. Plato fails in this no more than Kant or Descartes, or Spinoza. We believe in God, because He has been revealed to us, as any child may, and of the inner mystery of God a child may know as much as most folk. And while we receive implicitly the doctrine of the Holy Trinity because Infallible Scripture and the Church affirm it, we have never seen any human explanation or discussion of it entirely (as judged by human intellect) above reproach. The Holy Trinity, whether considered in a life above us, or in those forces working in us, is a matter of infinite mystery and compass; and while we read with thanks all reverent words about this Heart of the Faith, for ourselves, we always leave it as belonging to the realm of Infinite Awfulness veiled in shadows, and repeat, as a child with a simple heart, the ancient Creeds.

THE LIFE OF BISMARCK. *Private and Political. With Descriptive Notes of his Ancestry.* BY JOHN GEORGE LOUIS HESEKIEL. *Translated by* KENNETH R. H. MACKENZIE, F. S. A. *With Upward of One Hundred Illustrations, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. Franklin Square.* 1870.

The proof of Bismarck's quality is in the sound of Prussian cannon thundering in mighty but unequal battle against the ancient and warlike empire of the Franks. For it is he and his ideas which, by the confession of Germany herself, has raised Prussia in this age to her great pre-eminency before the world. The history of Prussia is that of a narrow and half-barbaric northern tribe, developed by astute military chieftains into a great military nation, making its sword heavy with the thrift, industry and intelligence of its people, until outmatching more ancient and magnificent Austria, it is bold to try issue of might with that France which aforetime, as at Jena, smote the Brandenbergers bitterly. Bismarck has led up Prussia to this eminency by a diplomatic policy, far-sighted, unscrupulous, lavish of blood and gold, and patient in that preparation which is the very soul of victory. Set down by his friends as outspoken and sincere in statesmanship, it would be nearer the truth, perhaps, to regard him as a man whose excuse before the tribunal of the Future must be, that whatever he has wrought or taken, was not for himself but to exalt and enrich that Prussia to whom he has given, with a great Titanic zeal, his fortunes and his endeavors. It is too soon to ascribe to his policy that crowning virtue of success, as the world counts it; but we at least may say, without contradiction, that it is a policy

which has for years perplexed, and alarmed European diplomacy and has now called all Europe to arms in a struggle whose future no man is wise enough to forecast.

As to this book it is eminently German and Boswellian. To Herr Hesekiel the name of Bismarck is one to conjure with, and he sets his hero on a very lofty pedestal. With true Teutonic plodding he has hunted out all the roots of the Bismarck family in a temper which seems to think that if Adam was not a Bismarck he ought to have been one. He goes back behind the cradle, and from that standpoint philosophizes with becoming gravity upon his ancestral honors, his Pomeranian surroundings, his nativity, his babyhood, childhood, young manhood, all in a very minute and ultra Germanic way. Then when his young hero begins to plume himself for higher flights than deer-shooting or a student's duel, our historic master of ceremonies comes forth with a shout into daylight and shows us, as he firmly believes, all the great things of his master's career: how he goes on as minister at Frankfort, St. Petersburg and Paris, and how he speaks in and finally rules the Prussian Parliament with only a minority behind him. His book is unshapely, inorganic and in fragments, and a mock heroic aim and a certain amusing grotesqueness and garrulousness pervade it; but after all, Herr Hesekiel has told us a great many new facts about his hero, and his book has no mean information in it. We gather from it, that Bismarck, born a North German, of an honest, hardy country stock of gentlemen, who lived, rode, fought and died hard, shows his breeding in a robust body, and a stormy, mastering or driving nature, which breaks through a wall that it cannot leap; that he was and is a brave, robust man in mind and body, ready to face rifles, mobs, or even a popular Prussian democracy, without flinching, and that he never swerves from his point; that in politics he does not believe in the people or new-fangled notions of the rights or capacities of the masses, but in the Prussian crown, as the fountain of all might, right and glory to the Prussian people, and that he is only a knight beside the throne to defend it from barricades and ballot boxes, and that in defending his king he defends himself and that mediæval landed aristocracy to which he belongs and in whose welfare his own fate is held safely; that in diplomacy he aims to make Prussia first, a magnificent German Empire of all Germans, defended by bayonets, wherein peoples are to find their welfare in their obedience to the aristocracy of which the king, by divine right, is head. As for the rest, he appears in these pages as a good husband and parent, a boon companion, and to his friends and those not at war with him, an eminently genial and friendly man. There is nothing of the Greek or Latin about him, but he is a hugely built and stormy-minded Teuton who can press harder than most men against whatever hinders him from his point.

The illustrations in this book are many of them ingenious and interesting; but we cannot refrain from saying, that many more of them, in sympathy with the text, have a grandiloquent and half comical air about them, and impress us as being about as much out of place as would be a series of comic illustrations of the siege of Troy.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN SCUDDER, M. D. *Thirty-six Years Missionary in India.* BY REV. J. B. WATERBURY, D.D. *New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. Franklin Square.* 1870.

We have a friend with us in the country who every August goes to study the habits of spiders and is sadly perplexed to know why God allows the female, when she has laid her eggs, to weave a net for her mate, and thus entangled, to suck his blood. We, on the other hand, are sorely perplexed to know how this book ever came to be written; or being written, ever found a publisher. For certainly the self-sacrificing missionary who buried himself in a foreign land could never have wished this publicity; and there is absolutely nothing in the book itself which ought to save its life. The missionary was a godly man, and he gave his life in a great sacrifice to his Master, which all Christians venerate. But the story is told in such hard, dull, anæsthetic fashion that it is like taking a man's life either to write it or to read it. There are no pictures, pathos, sentiment or beauty in it; and yet below all the brushwood and rubbish of these pages there is a martyr's face, and even these crude and cold words cannot drown the musical voice of a true soul who without doubt was a martyr to his faith. Every missionary's life is interesting, and therefore no story of it can, without crime, be dull. Look at the Life of Dr. Judson, as our defence in the accusing of all this stupid writing.

We will also add, that the religion of Jesus Christ is always full of beauty, gentleness, sweetness and peace. If one would see how completely it can be made something else, at which a healthy Christian soul chokes, let him read pp. 18, 19, giving an account of Dr. Scudder's residing in a certain family where one of its members was converted by "Boston's Fourfold State," rather than by the grace of God; and where an arrow from that book pierced her heart so that she had to go to Christ for Him to draw it out (*sic*).

Dr. Scudder was without doubt a Christian and, as we said, a martyr, but his biographer is not exactly the man to write his life or to lead men to follow his example.

"LIFTING THE VEIL." *Published by Charles Scribner & Co.* 1870.

Diamonds and crystals are both beautiful, but one befits the queen's crown, while the other must be content to keep its own humble rank. If "Gates Ajar" had not been written "Lifting the Veil" might impress us more favorably. We cannot help feeling while reading this book that it is a weak reproduction of the former. The originality and naturalness of the "Gates Ajar" redeem much that might be considered irreverent, while this last story lacks both these charms, and speculates on the chances whether in Heaven "a negro might not need his banjo and bones and a small boy his jew's-harp!" Still we find in it some very interesting conversations and striking thoughts with most comforting assurances *well-supported*, of the recognition of one's friends in Heaven. The chapter on the birth and death of Eleanor's baby is full of pathos, and must appeal to every mother's heart.

But the close similarity in conception and detail to "Gates Ajar" will make

this book always read as an imitation. And as we said before, who will take the better, when one can have the BEST? Gold is worth more than gilt.

THE HISTORY OF HORTENSE, DAUGHTER OF JOSEPHINE, QUEEN OF HOLLAND, MOTHER OF NAPOLEON III. *By John S. C. Abbott, author of "The French Revolution," "History of Napoleon Bonaparte," &c. &c.* New York: Harper & Bros. Franklin Sq. 1870.

Gibbon advanced the position that all history is a falsehood. This Mr. Abbott always appears anxious to prove. For in the above book, which by a singular coincidence was laid upon our table about the commencement of the present war between Prussia and the *late* Emperor of France, Mr. Abbott says in his last chapter,

"If Hortense from the spirit-land can look down upon her son, her heart must be cheered in view of the *honors* which his native land, with such *unprecedented unanimity*, has conferred upon him. And still more must her heart be cheered in view of the many, many years of *peace, prosperity and happiness* which France has enjoyed under his reign. *Every well informed man will admit that the kingdom of France has never, since its foundations were laid, enjoyed so many years of tranquillity, and of mental and material advancement at home, and also of respect and influence abroad, as during the reign of the son of Hortense.*"

WONDERS OF THE HUMAN BODY. *From the French of A. Le Pileur, Doctor of Medicines. Illustrated by Forty-Five Engravings.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

WONDERS OF GLASS-MAKING IN ALL AGES. *By A. Sauzay. Illustrated with Sixty-Three Engravings on Wood.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

THE SUBLIME IN NATURE. *Compiled from the Descriptions of Travelers and Celebrated Writers. By Ferdinand De Lanoye. With Large Additions.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

THE SUN. *By Amédeé Guillemin. From the French. By A. L. Phipson, Ph. D. With Fifty-Eight Illustrations.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

WONDERS OF ITALIAN ART. *By Louis Viardot. Illustrated with Twenty-Eight Engravings.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

The list of books just enumerated forms a continuation of Scribner's valuable "Library of Wonders." The plan of such a library is excellent, and has been well executed. There are a great number of scientific and other facts, with which, although formerly locked only in the breasts of savans, in these days of cheap knowledge all our youth should be acquainted. To those desirous of such information, we cannot point out any better works than the above, to aid them in attaining their object. The facts moreover are presented in a pleasing manner, and as profundity is not aimed at, the style is clear, and the explanations and demonstrations easily understood. It is worthy of

remark that all are from the pens of French authors, and this is itself a guaranty of vivacity.

The volume on "Italian Art" contains much excellent reading matter, and that on "The Sun" should be studied by all youth who love astronomy, while the work entitled, "The Human Body," will instruct all classes of readers. These works demonstrate in science what Mr. Abbott fails to do in history—that facts may be made interesting without distortion.

RUBRICS IN THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN LITURGIES, COMPARED. *An Essay read before the Clergy of New Haven County, at Waterbury, Conn., November 3d,* 1869. *By* E. EDWARDS BEARDSLEY.

DR. WILLIAM SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. *Revised and Edited by Prof.* H. B. HACKETT, D. D. *With the co-operation of* EZRA ABBOTT, LL. D. New York: *Hurd & Houghton.* 1869. *Part XXII.*

MY ENEMY'S DAUGHTER. *A Novel. By* JUSTIN MCCARTHY. *Author of "The Waterdale Neighbors," etc. Illustrated.* New York: *Harper and Brothers.* 1869.

HEGEL'S FIRST PRINCIPLES. *An Exposition of Comprehension and Idea (Begriff und Idee). Translated from the German of G. W. F. Hegel. And accompanied with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes. By* WM. F. HARRIS. New York: *John Wiley & Sons.*

BOUND TO JOHN COWPANY: *Or the Adventures and Misadventures of Robert Ansleigh. With Illustrations.* New York: *Harper & Brothers.* 1869.

THE PASTORAL WORK: *Or Sowing and Reaping. The Thirtieth Anniversary of the Rectorship of the Rev. Samuel M. Haskins, D. D., of St. Mark's Church, Williamsburgh. Commemorated on the Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity.* 1869. New York: *Slate & Janes.*

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF YALE COLLEGE. 1869–70.

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF TRINITY COLLEGE, 1869–70. Hartford Church Press Co. 1870.

BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, May, 1870. Leonard Scott Publishing Company. New York.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. CLXXXIII. January, April and July, 1870. American Edition. New York: The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street.

In the first of these numbers is a venture of an assault against Christianity, unexampled, we believe, in the history of Infidelity. The fashion of the age has been to extol the moral system of our Holy Religion, while deriding its supernatural attestation. But in an Article from the *Westminster*, an argument against its truth is deduced from its purity. The writer asks: "Is prostitution, after all, notwithstanding the teachings of Jesus and Paul, and the long-cherished belief of the Christian world in the righteous-

ness of what we have called Christian purism, an indispensable part of every considerable aggregation of human beings? And if so, what shall we say of Christianity which with an alleged supernatural sanction teaches us an exactly opposite doctrine?" If this objection against the Scriptures be valid, we suppose the Commandment should stand—"Thou *shalt* commit adultery."

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, No. CCLXVII. January and July, 1870. American Edition. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, No. 140 Fulton Street, New York.

These numbers have many valuable articles. That entitled "John Calvin in Church and State," presents a most impartial and interesting estimate of that eminent Divine, at once illustrious for the narrowness of his theology, the severity of his nature, and the brilliancy of his genius. His impress on Presbyterianism is like that of Wesley on Methodism. Hence the difference between the individuality of a human organization, and the Catholicity of a Divine Institution.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, No. CCLV. January and April, 1870. American Edition. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, New York.

THE NEW ENGLANDER. *Edited by* PROF. GEORGE P. FISHER, PROF. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, *and* WM. L. KINGSLEY. JULY, 1870, NEW HAVEN, STAFFORD PRINTING CO.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW. *Edited by* CHARLES HODGE, D.D., LYMAN W. ATWATER, D.D., *with the special co-operation of* REV. M. A. JACOBUS, D.D., REV. WM. HENRY GREEN, D.D., REV. EDWIN HALL, D.D., *President* C. A. AIKEN, REV. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D. and REV. WM. M. BLACKBURN. 1870. New York, CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 Broadway.

THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, July, 1870. *Editor*, W. T. MOORE, *Associate Editors*, W. K. PENDLETON, ISAAC ERRETT, ROBERT GRAHAM, DR. S. E. SHEPHERD, THOMAS NUNNELL, ALEXANDER PROCTER. Cincinnati, R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers, 116 and 117 West Fourth Street.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, LITTELL & GAY, Broomfield St., Boston.

THE JOURNAL OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY, July, 1870. WILLIAM T. DAVIS, St. Louis, Mo.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND ARTS. *Conducted by* Professors B. SILLIMAN and JAMES D. DANA, *in connection with* Profs. ASA GRAY and WOLCOTT GIBBS of Cambridge, and Profs. H. A. NEWTON, and W. JOHNSON, GEO. I. BRUSH and A. E. VERRILL of New Haven. Second Series. July and September. Vol. XLIX. New Haven, TUTTLE, MOREHOUSE & TAYLOR.

THE CHURCH REGISTER. S[illegible]nkee, Wisconsin.

THE CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE & MONTHLY REVIEW. September, 1870. T. & R. WHITE, Hamilton, Ontario.

THE SPIRIT OF MISSIONS. September, 1870. Nos. 17 & 19 Bible House, New York.

THE COLONIAL CHURCH CHRONICLE AND MISSIONARY JOURNAL, AND FOREIGN ECCLESIASTICAL REPORTER. August, 1870. W. H. BARTLETT & Co., 186 Fleet St. London

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MISSIONARY REGISTER. No. 3 Bible House, New York.

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD. 27 Bible House, New York.

THE PEOPLE'S MAGAZINE. July, 1870. London Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 77 Great Queen St. New York, POTT & AMERY, 5 and 13 Cooper Union.

There is probably no magazine published in the world, which more perfectly combines beauty of illustration and excellence of matter. It is equally suited to amuse the young and profit the old.

DIOCESE OF LONG ISLAND. Bishop Littlejohn's Primary Charge and Address, 1869.

JOURNAL OF THE EIGHTY-SIXTH CONVENTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH in the Diocese of New York.

JOURNAL OF THE THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION of the Diocese of Western New York. 1869.

JOURNAL OF THE FIFTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION of the Diocese of Maine. 1869.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, Chicago, 1869.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HOME FOR INCURABLES. New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, 113 Fulton Street.

THE SABBATH HYMN AND TUNE BOOK. Hamersly & Co., Hartford, Conn.

THE HOUSE OF REST FOR CONSUMPTIVES. The Rev. Horatio Potter, D. D., LL.D., D.C.L., President *ex-officio*. Henry J. Cammann, President. 8 Wall Street, New York.

D. APPLETON & Co.'s Monthly Bulletin of New Publications. 90, 92, and 94 Grand Street, New York.

THE BOOK BUYER. A Summary of American and Foreign Literature. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway, New York.

STEIGER'S LITERARISCHER MONATSVERIGT. 22 and 24 Frankfort Street, New York.

WOOD'S HOUSEHOLD MAGAZINE. S. S. Wood, Newburgh, New York.

SOUND WORDS. March, 1870. 44 Bible House, New York.

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY, 1868–69.

FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH ANNUAL REPORTS OF ST. LUKE'S FREE HOSPITAL. 1866, 69. Chicago.

A REMINISCENCE OF SLEEPY HOLLOW. By the Rev. Edmund Guilbert, M.A.

BIBLE SOCIETY RECORD. Bible House, New York.

WESTERN INSURANCE REVIEW. St. Louis, January, 1870.

VICK'S ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE, AND FLORAL GUIDE. 1870. Rochester, N. Y.

REGISTER OF RACINE COLLEGE. Racine, Wisconsin, for the Academical Year 1869–70. Milwaukee: Banks & Burdick, Church Printers.

THE CLOISTER AND THE HEARTH. By Charles Reade. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

ONLY HERSELF. A Novel. By Annie Thomas. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

HIRELL: A Novel. By the author of "Abel Drake's Wife," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

SO RUNS THE WORLD AWAY: A Novel. By Mrs. A. C. Steele. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

UNDER FOOT: A Novel. By Alton Clyde. Illustrated. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

THE RULE OF THE MONK: Or, Rome in the Nineteenth Century. By General Garibaldi. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

AN APPEAL FOR THE COMPLETION OF CHRIST CHURCH, and the Building of the New Schools. By Rev. T. S. Cartwright. Hamilton, Ontario.

CHURCH PAPERS: Or, Tracts for the People. Nos. 1 and 2. Toronto.

THE BIBLE AND THE COMMON SCHOOLS: Or, The Question Settled. By the Author of "The Church, Rome, and Dissent." Detroit: John H. Caine & Co. New York: Pott & Amery, E. P. Dutton & Co. Chicago: Mitchell & Clark. And all Booksellers East and West.

THE END OF THE WORLD, AND THE DAY OF JUDGMENT. Rev. William Rounseville Alger. Boston: Roberts & Brothers. 1870.

THE NOTICE BOOK: Consisting of Blanks for Clergymen and Choirs. Published by the Rev. N. Pettit. Bordentown, N. J. 1870.

NOT DISCERNING THE LORD'S BODY. By the REV. BENJAMIN B. GRISWOLD, M.A., Rector of Trinity School, Baltimore, and Presbyter in charge of the Chapel of the Holy Cross. Baltimore, GEORGE LYCETT, 35 St. Charles St. 1870.

LAY PREACHING. Sermon by the REV. WAYLAND HOYT, 530 Arch St. Philadelphia.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. For Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany. 1869-70. Fenton, Mich.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MIDNIGHT MISSION, 1869-70. New York.

TRINITY PARISH, NEW YORK. Free Chapel of St. Augustine, 262 and 264 Bowery. Sermon preached at the opening of the Chapel for Divine Service on the 4th Sunday in Advent. By the REV. MORGAN DIX, S.T.D. 1870.

THE NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY. Depository, Cooper Union, Fourth Avenue, 1869.

REPORT OF THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING of the Society for the increase of the Ministry, and the Board of Directors. Held in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, and the Church of the Holy Communion, New York, October 10th and 12th, 1869. Hartford, Church Press Company.

HOME AND ABROAD, Domestic and Foreign Missions, Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, September 15th, 1870. American Church Press Co. 111 East Ninth St., N. Y.

We are pleased to welcome every number of this new missionary monthly. Both its appearance, and its contributions will satisfy the expectation of the Church. Its circulation we hope will soon reach one hundred thousand. We predict that it will be a most valuable, and successful Agency in educating the Church for its vast work in our own country, and throughout the world.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY. July, 1870. Philadelphia, 530 Arch Street.

THE TECHNOLOGIST. Especially devoted to Engineering, Manufacturing and Building, May, 1870. Industrial Publication Co. 176 Broadway, N. Y.

THE THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM. A Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly. Nashville, Tenn., July, 1870.

THE EIGHTH ANNUAL CATALOGUE of St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y., 1869-70. Albany, J. Munsell, 82 State St.

THE ECLECTIC MAGAZINE OF FOREIGN LITERATURE. W. H. BIDWELL, Editor, E. R. Pelton, Publisher, 108 Fulton St., N. Y.

THE ART REVIEW. Chicago, E. H. Trafton, No. 115 Madison St. April, 1870.

LIBRARY OF EDUCATION. The Bible in the Public Schools. New York, J. W. Schermerhorn & Co., 14 Bond St.

REVOLUTION, OR NO? Four Sermons preached in Trinity Church, Pottsville. By Rev. William P. Lewis, Rector. Philadelphia, Richard Mc Cauley, Publisher, 1314 Chestnut St., 1870.

DIOCESE OF LONG ISLAND. Journal of the Second Convention, 1869.

HISTORICAL DISCOURSE. Delivered at the Semi-Centennial Celebration of Christ Church, St. Louis, on All Saints' Day, 1869. By the Rev. Mont-

gomery Schuyler, D.D. St. Louis, Mo. Printed by George Knapp & Co., 1870.

THE AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL WORKER. J. W. McIntyre, No. 4 South Fifth St., St. Louis.

TRADE CIRCULAR AND LITERARY BULLETIN. New York, Leypoldt and Holt, 451 Broome St., 1870.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME FOR LENT, HOLY WEEK, AND EASTER. 1870. Lenton, Mich. Osgood E. Fuller. Detroit, John H. Caine & Co.

THE AMERICAN CATALOGUE OF BOOKS FOR 1869. New York. Leypoldt & Holt, 451 Broome St. 1870.

THE CHOIR. A JOURNAL OF MUSIC. 4 Crane Court, Fleet St., E. C., April 9th, 1870.

THE NATION: THE FOUNDATIONS OF CIVIL ORDER AND POLITICAL LIFE IN THE UNITED STATES. By E. MULFORD. Hurd & Houghton, Riverside Press. 1870.

THE NEW YORK TEACHER AND AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY, April, 1870. J. H. Schermerhorn & Co., 14 Bond St., New York.

OUR WARDENS AND VESTRYMEN. BY O. S. BARTEN, D.D., Christ Church, Norfolk. Norfolk, 1870.

HAND-BOOK OF THE SULPHUR-CURE. BY WILLIAM I. FLAGG, Author of "Three Seasons in European Vineyards." New York, Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

CATALOGUE FOR PASTOR'S LIBRARY. Prepared by Professors at Andover, New Haven, and Chicago. Andover, Warren F. Draper, Main St. 1870.

OHIO VALLEY HISTORICAL SERIES. Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati. 1869.

RECORD OF CHRISTIAN WORK. Philadelphia, April, 1870.

NEW CYCLOPEDIA OF ILLUSTRATIONS. BY REV. ELON FOSTER. New York. W. C. Palmer & Co., 14 Bible House, Astor Place.

THE LITTLE CORPORAL. May, 1870. Sewell & Miller, Chicago, Ill.

HOURS AT HOME. New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. June, 1870.

RIVERSIDE MAGAZINE, for Young People, June, 1870. Hurd & Houghton.

HARPER'S NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE. June, 1870. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, New York.

BAFFLED. BY JULIA GODDARD. Illustrated. New York. Harper & Bros., Franklin Square. 1870.

A BRAVE LADY. By the Author of "John Halifax Gentleman," "A Life

for a Life," &c. New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

DEBENHAM'S VOW. BY AMELIA B. EDWARDS. Illustrated. New York. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

TOM BROWN'S SCHOOL DAYS. By An Old Boy. New York. Harper & Brothers. 1870.

MISS VAN KORTLAND. By the Author of "My Daughter ELINOR." New York. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

BENEATH THE WHEELS. By the Author of "Olive Vancoe," &c. New York. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, No. CIV. July, 1870. American Edition. New York: The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street.

BEECHER'S MAGAZINE. Published by J. A. Beecher, Trenton, New Jersey. American News Company, Agents, 117, 121 Nassau Street, New York.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE. September, 1870.

OLD AND NEW. July, 1870. Boston: Roberts & Brothers, 143 Washington Street. London: Sampson, Low, Son & Marston. 1870.

THE TECHNOLOGIST. June, July and August, 1870. Especially devoted to Engineering, Manufacturing, and Building. 176 Broadway, New York.

BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, New York. July, 1870.

HOURS AT HOME. A Popular Monthly of Instruction and Recreation. August, 1870. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway.

DIOCESE OF MARYLAND. Journal of the Eighty-Seventh Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF EASTON. Journal of the Second Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF VERMONT. Journal of the Eightieth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF GEORGIA. Journal of the Forty-Eighth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF OHIO. Journal of the Fifty-Third Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF CONNECTICUT. Journal of the Eighty-Sixth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF RHODE ISLAND. Journal of the Eightieth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF MISSOURI. Journal of the Thirtieth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS. Journal of the Eightieth Annual Convention, 1870.

THE BALTIMORE UNDERWRITER. Baltimore, August, 1870. No. 3 Post Office Avenue.

THE TRADE CIRCULAR AND LITERARY BULLETIN. Leypoldt & Holt, No. 25 Bond St., New York. 1870.

THE MANUFACTURER AND BUILDER. September, 1870. American News Company, 121 Nassau St., New York.

AN OFFERING OF LOVE TO THE REV. WILLIAM LUPTON JOHNSON, D.D. By one of the many who loved him, 1870.

THE DE VEAUX COLLEGE REGISTER. Fourteenth Year, 1870.

BROTHERHOOD AND SISTERHOOD OF SYRACUSE, 1870.

THE CHURCH A WITNESS. The Sermon before the American Church Union. Preached in Trinity Chapel, New York, at the Annual Meeting, April 28th, 1870. By Thomas A. Starkey, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C.

DISSENTING REASON FOR JOINING THE CHURCH. Sixth Edition, with Additions.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW YORK HISTORICAL SOCIETY on the Announcement of the Death of Thomas J. Bryan, June, 1870.

THE RIVERSIDE MAGAZINE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, September, 1870. Hurd & Houghton, No. 13 Astor Place, New York.

TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT of the Board of Managers of the Protestant Episcopal Church Missionary Society in the City and Port of New York, 1870.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. A Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Rev. O. T. Porcher. Abbeville, S. C. 1870. By Rev. U. P. Du Bose, 1870. Walker, Evans & Cogswell. Charleston.

IS THE WESTERN CHURCH UNDER ANATHEMA? A Problem for the Ecumenical Council of 1869. By Edmund S. Ffoulkes, B.D. Third Thousand. London. J. T. Hayes, Lyall Place, Eaton Square. New York: Pott & Amery.

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN GEOLOGICAL AND STATISTICAL SOCIETY, 1870. Vol. II. Part II. Edited by the Recording Secretary.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY. May 12th, 1870. New York.

YALE COLLEGE IN 1870.

THE WEEKLY COMMUNIONS AND CHURCH ORDINANCES. A Sermon preached at Venice, October 24th, 1869. By the Rev. John Davies Merreweather, B.A., Oxon, Chaplain. London, 1870. Rivington's, Waterloo Place, High Street, Oxford. Trinity Street, Cambridge.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND UNIVERSAL RELIGIOUS UNION. By the Rev. John Davies Merreweather, B.D., Oxon, English Chaplain at Venice. Bristol, 1870.

PREPARATION FOR THE HOLY COMMUNION. The Devotions chiefly compiled from the works of Bishop Taylor. By Miss Sewell. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway. 1870.

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF THE NASHOTAH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. 1869–70. Milwaukee. Hawks & Burdick, Church Printers. 1870.

AN OFFERING OF LOVE TO OLD ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, Hoboken. 1870.

HANDMAIDENS OF THE LORD. A Sermon preached in Christ Church, Poughkeepsie. June 16th, 1870. On the occasion of the Commencement of Cottage Hill Seminary. By the Rev. Benjamin H. Paddock, D.D., Rector of Grace Church, Brooklyn Heights.

D. APPLETON & Co.'s Monthly Bulletin of New Publications. New York, Sept. 1, 1870. 90, 92, and 94 Grand St.

AN ORATION delivered before the Wesleyan Academy Alumni Association, at Wilbraham, Mass. June 29th, 1870. By Damon Y. Kilgore, Esq., of Philadelphia.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE. By Rev. Hugh Ray Scott. Baltimore, 1870. Geo. Lycett, No. 44 Lexington St.

STEIGER'S LITERARISCHER MONATSVERICHT. E. Steiger, Verleger und Buchdrucker, 22 and 24 Frankfort Street, New York.

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD. September, 1870. No. 27 Bible House.

THE LITTLE CORPORAL. September, 1870. Sewell & Miller, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTER OF THE BISHOP SEABURY MISSION. 1870.

THE UNITED STATES INTERNAL REVENUE AND TARIFF LAW. Passed July 13th, 1870. Compiled by Horace E. Dresser. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

LECTURE INTRODUCTORY TO THE COURSE on Materia Medica and Hygiene. Delivered before the Medical Class of the University of Buffalo, November 28th, 1869. By Charles A. Lee, M. D. Buffalo: Published by the request of the Class.

KILMENY. By William Black, Author of "In Silk Attire," "Love or Marriage?" etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

GWENDOLINE'S HARVEST: A Novel. By the author of "Carlyon's Year," "One of the Family," "A Beggar on Horseback," "Found Dead," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

ADDENDUM.

A very large number of Books, Sermons and Pamphlets have been placed on the table of the Editor. He has found it impossible to notice them in this issue of the REVIEW as they deserve. They are therefore postponed until January, and as the number of that month concludes the magazine year, it is proposed to devote an unusual space to the review of Books.

ERRATUM.—On page 333 for "Cardinal," read "Archbishop."

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—JANUARY, 1871.—No. 4.

ART. I.—LATE WORKS ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.

1. *Haddan's Apostolical Succession in the Church of England.*
2. *Dr. Lee's Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England.*
3. *Bailey's Defence of Holy Orders in the Church of England.*

The last two years have witnessed most important additions to our long list of works on Anglican Orders. This revival of interest in a question never, at any time, entirely devoid of interest is noteworthy, and we naturally seek its cause. Is that to be found in the Vatican Council, or the wish to present our case to the Orthodox Eastern Church, or the desire to resolve fresh doubts at home, or the purpose to meet fresh objections on the part of Romish adversaries? Or are we to look for it in those mysterious and unconscious impulses which, when the time of need arrives, set unconnected minds at work in separate labors, all tending to one great result?

The staple of Romish attack, at all events, had not greatly changed. Few things, indeed, in all the history of religious controversy are more dreary than the "endless iterations" of Romish objections; the wearisomely monotonous way in which the

changes are rung over and over to the same dull tune, on Nag's Head story, and Barlow's Consecration, and the Edwardine Ordinals, and the doctrine of intuition, till one is forced to cry,—

> "Semper ego auditor tantum? nunquamve reponam,
> Vexatus toties rauci Theseide Codri?"

It is a sad and shameful story which tells how, on the part of Rome, this controversy has been managed. Nor is there in all of it a sadder page than that which records what one could say—did he say it in a petulant recognition of the weakness of his cause?—who had once received and rested in the Orders of his English mother. How had "the gold become dim?" how was "the most fine gold changed?" when John Henry Newman, in writing what to every man must be a solemn thing—to him how solemn!—*Apologia pro vitâ suâ,* could say of the Church of England:

> "As to its possession of an Episcopal succession from the time of the Apostles, well, it may prove it, and if the Holy See were so decided, I will believe it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own; but for myself, I must have St. Philip's gift, who saw the sacerdotal character on the head of a gaily-attired youngster, before I can by my own wit acquiesce in it, for antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts."

There is much, always, in the way of putting things. Taken out of the way in which it is put, Dr. Newman's argument, if such it can be called, amounts to this: First, That things do not wear that look to him in the Anglican Church, which he, *a priori*, thinks they ought to wear in any real Church; and secondly, that "antiquarian arguments," that is, in plain English, *historical evidence*, can have no weight as against the absence of things demanded on the ground of his *a priori* impressions. In a letter explanatory of the passage in the *Apologia*, Dr. Newman adds, that the "inquiring into Anglican Orders" (that is, we ask our readers again to observe, *the historical evidence for Anglican Orders*) is "dreary" to him, and leads, after all, only to "a probable conclusion."

All this is merely saying that a failure to come up to a preconceived ideal nullifies historical facts; that he to whom historical facts seem "dreary" is absolved from any obligation to consider them; and that nothing but mathematical demonstrations—for, be it remembered, they and probable conclusions form, (except, per-

haps, in Romish logic) the dichotomy of all conclusions—are of any value. One would suppose that the enunciation of such positions would be their sufficient answer. If any of our readers care to take them up at greater length they may turn to Appendix No. XX, in Dr. Lee's volume.

The rank and file of Roman controversialists must, indeed, here as well as elsewhere, be looked on very differently from the way in which we have hitherto been wont to regard them. Père Gratry's late letters have established the existence of two schools among the controversialists of Rome, one of which dishonestly falsifies history, while the other honestly, but blindly, accepts their falsifications. The existence of a falsifying school of writers *ecôle de mensonge*—had frequently been asserted, and as frequently denied. It can never be denied again with the smallest hope of gaining any credence for the denial. Nor can the exposure be shuffled off as a merely "probable conclusion." It stands, settled and established, in all its deformity and shame.

While, then, one class of Romish writers is characterized by that moral, or immoral, hardihood which holds that falsehood "well stuck to" is as serviceable as the truth, there is another and doubtless, a numerous class which simply repeats, parrot-like and by rote, the lesson it has been taught. Neither of these classes is likely to be reached by historical argument or evidence touching our English Orders. But surely there must be those, and in increasing numbers, who will listen to such evidence and argument. And to these it is worth while to speak, for these it is worth while to labor; while ever, for the Anglican Communion, the fullest and most searching examination of testimony is the one, single thing to be desired.

It is not likely that much can be added to the evidence finally collected and summed up in the three works, the names of which stand at the head of this Article. It may be, indeed, that confirmatory testimony may still be lurking in diaries or letters that have never yet seen the light; but it can be only confirmatory. The existing chain may admit of strengthening, but there is no missing link to be supplied. For we cannot count the mere absence of the record of Barlow's consecration as a missing link. The *lacuna* is entirely filled by other testimony, positive as well as negative; while it has been even said of those who still deny

Barlow's consecration, that "they have borrowed the arms at once of Strauss and Paulus, and have given their sanction to the weapons of infidelity by using them to throw doubt upon the facts of history. The weapons, let us remind them, are double-edged; they may cut away in some minds their trust in one class of truths, but it will be by destroying their confidence in all." In a word, the denial is now reduced to Pyrrhonism, pure and simple.

Each of the works named above has its own especial value. But Mr. Bailey's must, we think, be allowed to head the list. Its careful and, as matters stand, exhaustive collection of State papers and other documents is of great importance; and we are glad to learn is reprinted in octavo, with the purpose of furnishing a copy to every bishop who sat in the Vatican Council. We cannot, also, but be grateful for the very excellent chapter on Jurisdiction. This is, indeed, not only one of the most important, but one, also, of the most difficult questions in the controversy. Not that the difficulty is one inherent in our Anglican position, but that it grows out of the fact that Romish writers so constantly assume the very point at issue, *i. e.* that jurisdiction descends from St. Peter through the Papacy. The chapter which treats of this topic deserves the most careful study.

To Dr. Lee's book, we are compelled, however reluctantly, to take some exceptions; and of these it will be necessary to speak at some little length.

We shall, doubtless, be considered by some as over scrupulous, if not something more, when we object to the application of the term Sacrament to Holy Orders, so constantly made by Dr. Lee. And yet we do object to it, not, as we verily believe, without sufficient reason.

The difference between us and Rome as to the number of the Sacraments is not one, it must be remembered, of mere definition, and the controversy is not, therefore, a mere logomachy. With the entire question as to the number of the Sacraments we do not propose, here, to deal. We take it up only so far as it is connected with Holy Orders.

The Council of Trent, [Sess. vii, Can. vi.] asserts that the Sacraments of the New Law "confer grace on those who do not place an obstacle in the way." These sacraments of the New Law, are declared [Sess. vii, Can. i.] to be no "more or less"

the seven usually named, and asserted, each and every one hem, to be "truly and properly a Sacrament," "instituted by s Christ, our Lord." And it is further assumed, [Sess. vii, . iv.] that the grace communicated by them is the "grace of fication." For all these terms, therefore, and so for Holy Or-, there is claimed not only an outward sign, but "Christ's in-tion" and "justifying grace" as well.

ı full agreement with this is the teaching of the Trentine Ca-ism. After quoting from the *Civitas Dei*, St. Augustine's ıition, "A sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing," it gives an rged definition in these words: "A sacrament is a visible sign n invisible grace, *instituted for our justification.*" [Part ii, p. i, Question iii.] It then, [Quest. iv.] says, "The more r to develop this definition, pastors must explain its respective s." Proceeding with this development it explains the phrase ɜred thing" in St. Augustine's definition to mean "the grace ɩod which sanctifies us, and adorns us with the habit of all the ıe virtues." [Quest. vii.] Then, [Quest. viii.] it explains a ament more fully by saying that "it is a thing subject to the es, and possessing by the divine institution at once the power ignifying and accomplishing sanctity and righteousness." The ber of these sacraments is fixed at seven. [Quest. xiv.] It sets forth the effects of these sacraments as "principally ;" first, "the grace commonly called by the sacred doctors *fying*," (Quest. xxi.] which belongs to all the seven, [Quest. i.] and second, which, however, is not common to all, but pecu-to them,") "the character which they impress on the soul." hat here again, to all the seven is attributed not only Christ's tution, but justifying grace as well.

ow the Anglican Church is at war with Rome touching the ɔduction of Christ's institution and justifying grace into the ıition of a sacrament. She asserts, as plainly as Rome does, both these things belong to a sacrament. But she also as-ı, (and here she joins issue with the Trentine teaching), that in ı of those things to which Trent gives the name "Sacrament ıe New Law," do Christ's institution and justifying grace meet, pt in Holy Baptism and the Blessed Supper.

he application then, of the term Sacrament to Holy Orders lves either an acceptance of Roman doctrine, or else a use of

the term which requires a new definition; a definition differing from that of Rome as well as from that of England.

Again, on p. 7 of his volume Dr. Lee holds the following language; he is speaking of the Preface to the Ordinal:

"In this Preface, while the major or chief orders are retained, the minor orders, however, are not referred to. They existed in the Mediæval Church of England, and were almost identical with those still conferred in all parts of Roman obedience as a preparation for the major orders. Three of the seven among Roman Catholics are now called "sacred" or "holy," viz.:—the (1) priest, (2) deacon, and (3) subdeacon—the remaining four being respectively (4) acolyte, (5) exorcist, (6) reader and (7) doorkeeper. In the Eastern communions the division is not quite the same, nor indeed are the orders themselves precisely identical with those of the Latin Church. Here in England the office of *clericus* (clerk) has been retained, and in many cathedrals certain officials have been appointed ever since the Reformation to undertake some of those duties which had been previously performed by persons in minor orders."

Now it is surely an inaccurate statement to say that the Church of England retained the three major orders as set forth by the mediæval and the modern Roman Church. For what are those three major orders? According to the Trentine as well as the mediæval teaching, they are the priesthood, the diaconate, and the subdiaconate. This comes clearly out in chapter ii, of Session xxiii: while in the Trent Catechism [Part ii, Chap. vii, Quest. xii.] it is said that "according to the uniform tradition of the Catholic Church" the number of orders being seven, "the greater or *holy* [orders] are subdeaconship, deaconship, and priesthood."

How this definition and arrangement of Orders came about is well stated by Bishop Pearson. [Minor Works, Vol. I, p. 275.]

"In the first place the schoolmen, flattering the Roman Pontiff, have excogitated this ground for denying a distinction of order [between bishops and presbyters.] For they bring the sacrament of the Eucharist into the definition of orders, and they limit and determine it by this sacrament. So Soto roundly defines: Orders is a sacrament in which is conferred special power to consecrate the body and blood of Christ. To the same purpose speak others.* From this notion once admitted, it is easy to argue thus.

* As specimens of "others," take the definition of Alphonso Liguori, [*Theol. Mor.* Vol. II, p. 424, Ed. Bassini 1847.] Ordo est sacramentum quo traditur potestas circa Eucharistiam rite administrandam: or that of Penone, which is, indeed more guarded, quo spiritualis potestas confertur sacramenta conficiendi &c. [Praelectiones (abridged) Vol. II, p. 379.]

The Trent Catechism says, The power of order has references to the real body of Christ our Lord, in the Holy Eucharist. [Part II, Chap. vii, Quest. vi.]

ıll orders have reference to the Eucharist; wherefore, orders may be di-
erse so far as they diversely concur in the celebration of the Eucharist.
ut since the highest act connected with the Eucharist is the act of conse-
ration, and since this belongs to the priest, (that is the presbyter,) as such,
nd the bishop concurs in such consecration, no otherwise than the presby-
er, there is, therefore, no distinction of order between presbyter and
ishop."

Whether this definition was or was not devised for the benefit of
he Bishop of Rome, it was worked most diligently and thoroughly
or his behalf, and against the Episcopate. It culminated in the
rguments of the Jesuits and others at Trent; where every effort
as made to declare the Papacy alone to be of Divine right, and
he Bishops to hold from the Pope. Guettee [Hist. des Jesuites,
ol. I, p. 118] gives the reasoning of Lainer the General of the
esuits in these words:

"All which comes from God is *jure divino;* but Jesus Christ gave to Peter
nd his successors active and absolute authority in the Church: wherefore,
ıe pope possesses this authority in its entireness, *jure divino*, consequently,
ıe jurisdiction of the bishops does not come from God, except mediately
nd by the pope." We need not pursue the matter further.

Now, however much such speculations may have befogged our
ıglican Reformers in the beginning, and however much they
ıay have told later on, on the individual opinions of even such
ıen as Hooker, Field, and Mede, it is certain that our Ordinal
ontains the protest of the Anglican Church against them all. So
ır is its Preface from *retaining* as Dr. Lee says "the major or
hief orders," as they were then held and known in the West, that
does not even name them, "priest, deacon, subdeacon;" and it
oes name three other orders, and no more, "bishops, priests, and
eacons," said in the Preface to have existed "from the Apostles'
me," and declared, in the body of the Ordinal, to have been ap-
ointed by the "Holy Spirit," and the "Divine providence" of
lmighty God.

The Ordinal, therefore, records the entire emancipation of our
eformers from those scholastic speculations about orders, which
ad resulted so disastrously in destroying the divinely appointed
onstitution of the Church, and bringing to naught the power of
s entire Episcopate. If some afterwards so forgot its clear decla-
ations as to call those who recurred to them bringers in of novel-
es, that is nothing to the purpose. There those declarations are,

making no mention of any minor orders, and (with an entire incognition of the major orders as laid down by the schoolmen, and set forth at Trent,) asserting that the divinely instituted orders in the Church, are Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. When at the Savoy Conference, the title of the form for making a Bishop was changed, so that instead of "The Form of consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop" it read "The Form of *ordaining* or consecrating &c.; and where at the same time, the words "ordination," and "ordained" were added in the Preface, all that was done was to bring the places thus changed into full agreement with the original declaration of the Preface concerning the three orders. The distinction of the order of Bishops from that of Priests was not *then* for the first time asserted. Nor was it, even, by Bancroft in his sermon at St. Paul's Cross in 1589. In either case the original declaration of the Preface was renewed, and that was all.

We may add here the doctrine of the Eastern Church as stated by the Abbè Guetteè, [*Exposition de la Doctrine*, p. 104.] La seule hierarchie divinement institueè est cette de sacredon, partagè en èpiscopat, pretrise, et diaconat.

Bearing, therefore, cordial testimony to the great value of Dr. Lee's volume, we must express our earnest wish that he had not used language which, to say the least, is open to the charge of looseness and inaccuracy.

One curious fact connected with Romish doctrine concerning Holy Orders, we may touch upon in passing. It is more worth considering now, than it was before the Decree of Infallibility was passed.

In 1439 Pope Eugenius IV. issued a Decree touching the reconciliation of the Armenians with the Western Church. It is a long and carefully worded document, setting forth, at great length, the points which the Armenians are to accept; [*Labbe and Coisart's Concilia*, Vol. XIII, Col. 529.] and it is issued *ad perpetuam n memoriam.* Large space is given in it to the Sacraments; and concerning Orders the Pope thus pronounces:

"The sixth is the sacrament of orders, the matter of which is that by the delivery of which order is conferred; to the presbyterate is conferred by the porrection of the chalice with the wine and the paten with the bread; the diaconate by the giving of the book of the Gospels; the subdiaconate by

ie delivery of the empty chalice with the empty paten placed upon it. 'he form of the priesthood is, Receive power to offer sacrifice in the Church or the living and the dead." [Col. 538.]

Now here was a difficulty and not a small one. The Church *ad* always held, and *has* always held, that imposition of hands lone, with prayer, made the sign and the words requisite to a true rdination. Even Pearson, while he says that the schoolmen, and ot a few more recent theologians, put the "tradition of the instruments" into the matter of the Sacrament of orders, still adds, Communior vero nunc evasit illorum opinio qui eam constituunt *sola manuum impositione.*" [Vol. II., p. 395, Abridged Prælections.] And this view, which he adopts, he justifies, (1) from cripture, (2) from all the rituals of nine centuries, (3) from the postolic Constitutions, (4) from all the Fathers, and the Liturists of the VIIth, VIIIth, and IXth centuries, and (5) from the ustom of the Greeks and other orientals. All this certainly, ives a very tolerable *consensus*, but utterly in opposition to the ecree of Pope Eugenius.

The difficulty was felt; but how to get out of it? It would not o to try here the plan followed in the case of Honorius, and talk bout a private letter, and the utterance of a private doctor. 'here was nothing private about the document. It was a Papal ecree, pure, simple, and undeniable. What was to be done?

Bellarmine appears to have contrived the explanation which has nce been generally used for the benefit of Eugenius, or those who iffer from him, as the case may be. Let us take the explanation s given by Alphonso Liguori [*Theol. Mor.* Vol. II., p. 428.]:

"Eugenius is only speaking *of the integral matter and form* which he in nded to give to the Armenians who desired to be aggregated to the Latin 'hurch; wherefore, it was not needful to designate the imposition of hands ecause they already used that."

This is, if one may be pardoned a slang phrase, "a very neat odge." But the answer to it is easy. The Armenians used ater in baptism, bread and wine in the Eucharist, and chrism in onfirmation; and yet Eugenius carefully mentions each of these iings as the matter of these sacraments—for, of course, he numers confirmation as a sacrament. It would have been very conenient, doubtless, for many persons coming after him, if he had poken differently in the case of orders, from his way of speaking

in the case of other sacraments. But, excepting this convenience and its opposing inconveniences, there is no ground for saying that he did. And so, for all we can see, a Papal definition stands to-day, deserted, given up, contradicted, and denied by the *communior opinio* of Roman theologians.

To return again for a moment to the historical evidence for our Anglican Orders. We know of nothing in all history that is so abundant, whether it be direct and documentary testimony, or indirect and confirmatory. The hypothesis of a forgery of the documents thus disposed of by Mr. Haddan [p. 198]:

"Dr. Mason, or whomsoever the controversialists light upon as the possible forger, must have been so marvelous a conjurer, that [between 1604 and 1613] he first of all invented half a dozen complicated series of documents, all minutely tallying, both with each other and with all known history on the subject; and then inserted all of them, utterly unsuspected by any body, into every one of their several repositories, over no one of which he had the slightest control, and of one or two of which he literally did not know the existence,—at Canterbury, Lambeth, London, Cambridge, Zurich, and the great Episcopal and Capitular archives all over the kingdom;—and that he did this with such exquisite juggling, as *e. g.*, to insert large portions into Parker's Register at different places (for the several Episcopal consecrations happened at different dates), and yet to have made them exactly fit in with all the rest, as if they had been there from the beginning, and (more marvelous still) fit in exactly also with every one of the numerous other documents elsewhere, many of which he could not possibly have ever seen."

This is admirably put. Nor is Mr. Haddan's summing up of the evidences against the Nag's Head story less acute. We are sure our readers, at least, those who may not have seen his volume, will thank us for quoting it.

"To sum up the question, we have on the one side the natural, legal, and, presumably *a priori*, certain, series of facts, respecting these consecrations, testified legitimately and regularly by the proper registrars and other records, with no internal grounds for suspecting unfair dealings with those records, and with perfect agreement between the various and independent classes into which they are divided. We have, further, independent testimony from many distinct sources, some of them out of the reach of the possibility of being tampered with, and one of them buried at Zurich, out of sight and out of knowledge until a quarter of a century since. And, besides this mass of documents, we find that every allusion, whether of friend or foe, for half a century after the facts, takes those facts for granted, whether in history, or in controversy, or in courts of law, or in solemn synod and Parliament.

"And against all this conclusive weight of evidence, attached, as it is, to a reasonable, natural, and coherent statement, there stands literally nothing except a hearsay story, repeated when once uttered in a variety of shapes, but bearing gossip and libel written on the face of all of them; in itself impossible to the degree of being absurd, and published for the first time forty-five years after date in a foreign country, and by a writer whose position precluded him from sifting, almost from knowing, the truth, had he wished to do so, and whose book and character stamp him as a virulent and reckless controversialist, who had no wish of the kind. And that story was indignantly contradicted, the instant it became really public. There is nothing to be said upon such a statement, except that if a controversial writer wishes to stamp the character of his work as worthless, and his own controversial morals as discreditable, he has the means ready at hand by adopting and maintaining the Nag's Head fable."

We wish that Mr. Bailey's Defence, in the mother tongue, might be separately printed, in an inexpensive way for general circulation.

The photosyncographic (what a fearful word!) fac simile of Parker's Register is, undoubtedly, of great value to the scholar. It brings him face to face with the actual event. He seems to be carried back to the very year 1559, and to touch hands with those whose acts placed Parker in the vacant chair of Augustine. No one, we venture to say, can look on and decipher those ancient records, and especially that grim and curious *Rituum et Ceremoniorum Ordo in consecratione Reverendissimi Doctoris Mathaii Parker*, with its historic names and strange words, without having the occasion and the sense brought home to him as they never were before.

So, too, the Latin Defensio is most valuable to scholars, and most timely in every point of view. But the Defence in English is for all the members of the Anglican Church, and we wish it might be placed in their hands. Attacks are made upon our orders in more and more covert ways than we imagine. Hints, sneers, insinuated doubts are thrown out in the chance interviews of travel or of social life, and a brief, telling treatise would be welcomed every where. An octavo edition of the Defensio, for foreign scholars, has been published. Let us try for a cheap edition of the Defence for those whose reading does not go beyond our own lan-

ART. II.—THE FALL OF THE TEMPORAL PAPACY.

No one who understood the various interdependent elements of European and especially of Italian politics could have failed to realize—even from a point of view so low and human—that when war was declared between France and Prussia the downfall of the temporal power of the Popes was decreed. Still less was it possible for Christian faith to doubt that, in an hour when the Lord seemed to have made bare His arm,—to be revealing to a skeptical age His visible control over the affairs of men—so fearful an apostacy as that which was completed on the 18th of July last would long await its swift retribution: and many a one, when they read of the thick darkness which filled St. Peter's, as the blasphemy was about to be formally proclaimed, and of the terrible peal of thunder which immediately answered it from heaven, must have felt that the Roman Papacy had at last exhausted God's long suffering, and that its doom had been pronounced. Never before, as it seems to us, in the long course of Christian history, has the overruling Providence of God been more clearly visible than it is now, in this wild rush of human policy and of secular events onward to His own destined purposes.

The immediate and inevitable result of the Franco-Prussian war was the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome. This was not so much because these troops were wanted elsewhere, as because their presence in Italy alienated the people and fomented a popular Prussian feeling stronger than the ties of the Italian Government to France; and, therefore, thus only could France hope for Italian aid, or even secure Italian neutrality. So the French troops were recalled, leaving Rome and the Papal provinces to the protection of miscellaneous foreign mercenaries and enthusiasts; and Italy to the revived Convention of September 15th, 1864. This was the *first* step.

The rapid and overwhelming succession of German victories which followed, soon gave especial importance to the policy of the neutral powers, any one of which, by entering into the strife, could precipitate a European war. This, in turn, gave a new degree of independence to Italy as one of these; and upon the 29th

of August the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Visconti-Venosta, addressed to the foreign representatives of the Italy Government a very able and most significant circular. This document set forth the increasing gravity of the Roman question in the present disturbed state of Europe; distinguished between the political and ecclesiastical interests involved; pointed out both that Rome was a centre of direct intrigue against the interests, the peace, and indeed, against the very existence of the Italian Kingdom, and also that it furnished a continual pretext for popular agitation on the part of revolutionists against a form of government which they loudly declared incapable of completing the unification of Italy; and, therefore, that the prompt settlement of this question had become an imperative duty of self-preservation. The Italian Government, nevertheless, frankly recognized the interest which the other European powers had in this question, in its ecclesiastical aspects, and especially their right to require that the "Head of the Catholic Church" should not be so subjected to any one power as to enable the latter to make use of the Pope and of his authority, for the purpose of interfering in the affairs of other nations. The Convention of September was, moreover, plainly declared no solution of this Roman question, but simply a guarantee that this solution should not be sought by violent means. Recognizing fully the complication of these apparently antagonistic interests, and yet at the same time believing that the other powers had no wish to prolong a condition of things so perilous to Italy, the Italian Government proposed to arrange with the other Catholic powers a satisfactory system of guarantees against the ecclesiastical difficulty; and, finally, the circular quietly suggested that the suppression of the temporal papacy would be quite as truly for the good of other nations as for Italy itself,—"since it is not only in Italy," it concludes, "that the antagonism between the religious sentiment and the spirit of civilization and liberty disturbs the conscience and spreads moral disorder among the people."

Such is an abstract, not so much of the *language* of this circular, as of its meaning, when it is filled out with those little additions which diplomacy prefers to suggest and imply and take for granted as mutually understood. The public did not know of this document until lately; but it was *another* most important step in the

development of what the Government terms the policy of going to Rome by moral means.

Upon the second of September, ere this circular had fairly reached those to whom it was addressed, came the victory of Sedan and the capture of the Emperor Napoleon (the news of which reached Florence on the 4th), and upon the 4th itself, the Paris revolution, the overthrow of the Empire, and the proclamation of a French Republic. The immediate effects of these events upon the Roman question was twofold. By substituting those French statesmen who had *opposed*, for the Government which had *exacted* the September Convention, this revolution gave Italy a virtual release from its obligations; and by greatly strengthening the revolutionary party in Italy, and giving them new hopes of overthrowing the monarchy, it made it more necessary than ever that the Government should at once, by satisfying the popular demand for their "natural capital," deprive the revolutionists of their power to rouse the people.

All Italy understood this in a moment. The Government must not only have appreciated, but it must have acted instantly upon this new state of things; for, upon the 6th, it was announced in Berne that "the Italian Government had declared officially to the Federal Council that it had decided to occupy the Roman States with troops," etc., etc., and that "an identical declaration had been addressed to all the governments, including the provisional government at Paris."

The same day—Tuesday, September 6th—Florence was all excitement. The *Opinione* had made this glad announcement in the morning, and the *Italie* of the 7th, (it is always published the evening before its nominal date) that night confirmed the joyful news by a striking leading article entitled *A Rome!* in which, assuming the fall of the temporal power as already morally accomplished, it threw itself, with a bold abruptness, most characteristic of the state of mind of intelligent men amid this hurrying onward of events, into a discussion of its meaning and results. We shall speak of this article again.

The fortnight which followed was a period of such unflagging excitement and impatience—official utterances and the successive steps of government, popular meetings, telegrams, newspaper-leaders, plans, rumors, and speculations—all thronged and pressed

impetuously forward to the great result which now loomed up ainly in sight, that trying to recall it now, is like trying to recall e bewildering incidents of some wild dream.

The demonstration in Florence was followed by meetings in ilan, in Turin, in Verona, in Venice, in Naples, in Palermo— e after another, seemingly in every city and town from one end Italy to the other. Reading the telegrams, morning after orning, one could almost hear Italy—as though all her passionate rnestness had burst forth at once—with one voice demanding r Capital. The pressure upon the Government gave it the single oice of leading or being utterly overwhelmed. Troops hurried om Turin and Milan, through Florence, to one frontier; troops rried up from Naples northward to the other; frigates, fitted t in hot haste, sailed promptly from Spezia for the papal coasts. n. Govone, the Minister of War, literally broke down in the idst of it, crazed by the rush and pressure of the emergency, and signed, as it was then thought, to die.

But Visconti-Venosta had promptly anticipated all this by the ue of another circular, upon September 7th, pointing out to the binets of Europe the necessity of immediate action. In fact no nistry, not the monarchy itself, could, for one day, have resisted e popular will; a wand could as soon have resisted the spring od of the Arno at mid course as the Government have told the alian people, at this time, that they could not go to Rome. The inister of Foreign Affairs plainly told Europe as much in this cond circular—though of course in diplomatic and conventional raseology—and declared that the security of Italy and her neuality in the present war could only be preserved by putting an d to "a state of things which maintained in the heart of the ninsula a theocratic government in open hostility to Italy, and ich, by its own confession, could only subsist by means of forgn intervention, and whose territory offers a base of operations all the elements of disorder."

Minghetti had, at the same time, been sent to Vienna; another nfidential agent more quietly to Paris, and probably others elsenere; and they all brought or sent back the assurance that no wer was any longer disposed to interfere on behalf of one who d declared war against the very principles upon which modern vernments rest, and who, claiming infallibility while he put forth

the most arrogant pretentions, set himself beyond the reach of reason and of reform.

Simultaneously, several of the first statesmen of Italy were called to. Florence to advise with the Government, and Count Ponza di San Martino, an eminent nobleman of an old Piedmontese family, was selected to bear a letter to the Pope from the King of Italy. This letter and the Count's instructions bear date the 3d. They both show the Government equally determined to take possession of Rome and of the surrounding territory and thus to put an end to the *temporal* power, and profoundly deferential to the *spiritual* position of the Holy Father and "Head of the Catholic Church." They pray the Pope to accept the inevitable event with a good grace; to put himself into harmonious relations with the King and Government of Italy, offering him at the same time the guarantees promised to Europe. What the terms thus offered were, we have not as yet been officially informed; but if the statement of the papers be correct they provide that the Pope shall retain his sovereign dignity and inviolability; they include also the neutralization of the Leonine City as his residence, the free communication through Italian territory with foreign powers and churches, the preservation of the ecclesiastical institutions in Rome as well as of their property, a civil list which should support the Pope and continue to the Cardinals their present income, the renunciation of the royal right to ecclesiastical patronage, in the city of Rome itself, and a pledge of non-interference with the Italian Bishops and clergy "in the exercise of their spiritual ministry." The more these terms are studied, the more admirable, as a whole, they appear. Some interference with ecclesiastical property around Rome is absolutely essential if the Campagna is ever to be brought under proper cultivation, or Rome itself made a healthy city; but aside from this, these guarantees were all that a Pope who wished only to fulfill his spiritual duty as the head of the Roman Catholic Church could ask, and all that a government jealous for the future peace and welfare of the country could grant. In the last two particulars is quietly implied a reservation of the right of ecclesiastical patronage outside of Rome and of the right to interfere when Italian ecclesiastics transcend the bounds of their spiritual ministry.

Count San Martino saw Cardinal Antonelli and the General

of the Jesuits on Friday night, Sept. 9th, and on Saturday morning, between 10 and 11, he had a formal audience from the Pope. All the world knows his answer. *Non Possumus!* God be praised.

The next day, Sunday, September 11th, the Italian troops crossed the frontier at three several points. Gen. Cadorna, with the principal army, marched from Terni directly upon Rome itself; Gen. Bixio crossed from Orvieto, first occupied Viterbo, and then rapidly marched upon Civita Vecchia; Gen. Angioletti entered the papal territory by Frosmone and Anagui.

The day after the 12th, for, as will be noticed, not *one* of these successive days passed without its event, the Minister Guadasigilli, Sig. Raeli, by way of illustrating unmistakably the reservation just referred to in the terms offered to the Pope, addressed a circular to the Italian Bishops, which possessed in an eminent degree the merit which had characterized all the late utterances of the Government in this connection—that of plain speaking. Assuming that the Bishops were aware that the Italian troops had now entered the Roman provinces, he informs them that the Government had offered to the Pope the largest guarantees of his independence and support in the exercise of his *spiritual* power; assures them that the Government do not intend, and will not permit the least offence to the Church or to its clergy in the exercise of their *spiritual* ministry; but that it is, at the same time, "decided to fulfill its own duty to the nation, that is, not to permit the clergy, by any act or discourse, or in any other manner whatever, to attempt to stir up disobedience of the laws or of the measures of the public authority, by censuring the institutions or laws of the State; to excite contempt or dissatisfaction with the same, or to disturb the public conscience and the peace of families." This admirable circular closes with the warning that the Government would proceed against all offenders "with all the rigor of the law;" and exhorts the clergy to act in a way "to honor their high mission and by their own moderation to impress moderation upon all others."

The opportunity for acting upon the intention of this circular did not tarry, for the very next morning, the 13th, the three chief clerical journals of North Italy, the *Unita Cattolica* of Turin, the *Osservatore Cattolico* of Milan, and the *Ancora* of Bologna, failed to appear as usual, and the news was soon in circulation that they

had been sequestrated, doubtless in each case, as in that of the *Ancora*, "for provocation and transgression against constituted order, vows, and threats of destruction of the Government, offences against the laws and even indirectly against the sacred person of the King." When these papers appeared the morning following it was in deep mourning, and their menaces, though now in a more subdued key, gave sufficient evidence of the spirit in which ultramontanism would meet all the efforts of Italy to come to amicable terms with the Pope. In the only instance which has come to public knowledge—the infuriate Bishop of Mondovi replied to the above circular of Raeli, in the language of contempt and insolence. It is not at all improbable that the larger proportion of the Italian Episcopate and clergy only wait the *mot d'ordre* from Rome to break out into rebellion against the Government, and that this order would come if there were the least possibility of success.

Meanwhile, the Italian armies marched on. At *Civita Castellana* the Papal troops made a short resistance; but everywhere else they retired before the Italian advance. Town after town, freed from the Papal authorities, unfurled the tricolor and proclaimed provisional giuntas, and shouts of welcome greeted the Italian troops at every step. Upon Thursday, the 15th, Gen. Bixio reached Civita Vecchia, which, after some deliberation, surrendered without contest. The same day Gen. Cadorna arrived under the walls of Rome.

And now negotiations were once more attempted. Cavaliere *Blanc*, the Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, joined the army to take charge of this department; and Baron Arnim, the Prussian Minister at the Court of Rome, proffered his services to secure, if possible, an understanding. At his instance an armistice was granted; but it was soon announced that the Pope, deeply as he regretted the unavailing sacrifice of life that would follow, was powerless to prevent it; that Kauzler and De Charette, not he, were really masters, and that the foreign troops were determined to resist. Regarded as mere transparent hypocrisy this aroused general indignation and contempt, which subsequently proved to be undeserved. In fact the Pope consented only to such a resistance as would constitute the taking of Rome a forcible conquest, and ordered that upon the first breach all further defence should instantly cease. This should be known to his

credit. But it was not known then; it was only known that the last overtures to avoid the shedding of blood had been refused, and in a state of excited and almost angry expectation all Italy awaited, hour by hour, news from Rome.

At 1 o'clock, on Tuesday, September 20th, anxious Florence was aroused by a commotion in the streets. A man, bearing the Italian flag, and followed by a crowd wild with delight, came down the Via Tornabuoni (where we were so fortunate to be at the time), proclaiming the long expected news—*Rome was taken!* Rapidly, one after another, flags were flung out from public and from private buildings, from banks, reading-rooms, and cafés. Boys ran from street to street, with brief, hastily printed supplements, announcing that fire had been opened that morning at 5½ o'clock against Porta Pia and Porta Salaria (those who have visited Rome will remember the first, as just having been elaborately restored by the present Pope and leading to S. Agnese, and the other as leading to the Villa Albani); that at 3½ a breach had been made in the wall between the two gates; at 9½, Porta Pia was carried, and at 10 two divisions of Cadorna's army had forced the barricades and entered Rome simultaneously by these two ports of ingress. This was all we knew that day. Up went the national colors on the tall tower of the Palazzo Vecchio and from the Palazzo Terroni (the Municipality) as confirmation of the joyful tidings.

By two o'clock the whole city was *imbandierata* (em-banner-ed) and the Stars and Stripes floated in sympathy from several American residences in the *Quartière Galileo*, outside the Porta Romana. Soon the unwilling church bells, nay, even the great bell of the Duomo, were ringing loudly and lustily; the people had everywhere taken possession of them in spite of their custodians, and, by means of relays, many of these were kept ringing for hours with scarce an interruption. A column being formed in the Piazza di Santa Trinita, and having obtained flags and a band of music from the municipality, traversed the Vie Tornabuoni, Rondinelli, Cerritani, and Calzaiuoli to the Piazza Signoria, rousing the utmost enthusiasm. Windows were thrown open, men clapped and shouted their *vivas*, ladies waved their handkerchiefs, and in the Piazza the bersaglieri on guard responded heartily. Thence the people pressed to the Pitti Palace and shouted for the King. *Viva il Rè!*

Viva Roma, Capitale d'Italia! Viva il Rè in Campidoglio! But the King was not in the palace at the time.

We went out again at 5. The crowds were gathering in every open space. A number of young men, who had taken possession of Giotto's campanile, were erecting a flagstaff on its level summit and had already unfurled the Italian tricolor; others were hanging lamps for illuminating the Loggia de' Lanzi. Bands of men and boys marched along the streets in every direction, relieving their exuberant excitement by shouts and clapping of hands and singing. *Scarcely a priest was anywhere to be seen.*

Again we went out at night. The Piazza Signoria was filled by such a crowd as one sees only in Italy—perhaps only in Florence—a crowd where there is no crowding. A torch-light procession escorted the music to the Loggia de' Lanzi, and for some forty minutes they listened to one patriotic air after another, their plaudits making the Piazza reëcho. Their excitement seemed unbounded; their good humor and good behavior equally so. Gentlemen with their wives and young daughters mingled freely among them in every direction, and came and went enjoying the scene with the rest. The Florentine lily in gas jets surmounted each lamp post, clusters of oil lamps hung in the loggia itself, and branches of them were thrust out from many windows. Michael Angelo's *David* stood up white and tall in the pride of conscious symbolism in the illuminated piazza; the *Perseus* of Giovanni da Bologna and Donatello's *Judith* relieved against the radiance of the loggia seemed to stand out as if their meaning had each a new and special claim to recognition, and the double row of Florence's noble sons to step from their niches along the Uffizi into the unwonted light. From the top of the campanile now blazed Bengal fires, successive red and white and green.

The music over at the loggia, again the band and banners led the way to the royal palace, where a double arch of lights blazed over the main entrance and the royal flag of Italy was flying overhead. Again the people called loudly for their King, and he came forward on the balcony three times and in gesture thanked them for their greeting, while the air was filled with *vivas: Viva il Re! Viva Roma! Viva l'esercito! Viva il Re in Campidoglio!* At a later hour the King went to the theatre and was there received with the same overflowing enthusiasm of loyalty, patriotism, and

wild delight at the attainment of that which, for ten years, has been the goal of every patriotic Italian's hopes and aims, the completion of Italian unity by the occupation of Rome as her *natural Capital.*

Thus, was Florentine national feeling rejoicing at the event which will be rather an injury to Florence herself. How different from the narrow provincial selfishness which once reigned upon the banks of the Arno! How full of promise for the future!

The news since received from Rome adds little as yet to what has thus been told. The gates and batteries once carried the fighting ceased; the white flag went up on every side, and the Italian troops took possession of the Eternal City. Detachments from each of the five armies occupied Rome itself, while the main body remained encamped without. Bixio came down from the Villa Pamfili, by the Via Aurelia, and entered the Porta San Pancrazio; Angioletti marched up from the Porta San Giovanni and the old Lateran; Terrero advanced along the Via di Porta Pia and halted upon the Piazza del Quirinale; while others pressed onward to the Piazza Colonna. As if by magic, tricolor banners, hitherto carefully concealed, greeted them on every side, and flowers were thrown from the windows along their routes.

The city was surrendered to the Italian forces—the Papal troops were granted all the honors of war in recognition of their gallantry and their fidelity to their flag and principles. The Leonine City was respected; but the Pope himself soon asked for Italian protection, and a regiment of bersaglieri was, therefore, encamped in the Piazza of St. Peter's, and under the windows of the Vatican; and a great popular comitia was summoned to meet on the 22d in the Colosseum, to render the thanks of the Roman people to the King and army of Italy for the liberation of their city.

Gen. Masi was put in military charge; a Provisional Giunta, including members of some of the principal Roman noble families, was constituted to assume the city government; it was announced that a *plebiscite* should be held on October 2d, when the Romans should decide upon the future of the seven-hilled city. Rome at last was free; and the Temporal Power of the Pope King was at an end *forever!*

The rejoicings in every part of Italy beggar language to describe. In fact, the Italian newspapers themselves have been

forced to give it up. After some brief accounts of the reception of the news in the chief cities, they could but publish the telegrams as they came in from every direction; and then the very numbers of these being beyond their space to print, they have been obliged to content themselves, morning after morning, with long lists of the places from which these had been received. Very, very rarely can it be said, with such near approach to literal truthfulness, that a whole people are rejoicing.

That the seat of Government will be removed to Rome with all possible expedition, however doubtful before this event, can, we think, be no longer so. The same uprising of the Italian people which both compelled and enabled the Government to accomplish this, has at the same time proclaimed *Roma, il Capitale d'Italia!* To satisfy this feeling, it was at once and with amusing promptness announced—in fact, even before Rome was actually occupied—that a commission had been appointed to examine the public buildings of Rome, with a view to determine what were adapted to the requirements of the various offices of the Government. The Quirinal will, of course, become the royal palace—and never again will the College of Cardinals hold their Conclave there to elect another Pope; the Italian Parliament, meeting in the Capitol, will look down upon the Forum hoary with memories of two thousand years and more, but of no scene or day more fraught with blessings and great results to all mankind than this.

Whether the Pope will remain in Rome or not is not known as yet; but at all events the Leonine City, which was offered him and which he refused to accept, has been admitted to vote with the rest of Rome, and has become a constituent part of the Kingdom of Italy.

Such an event certainly deserves more than a superficial examination, since an understanding of the real influences and interests which brought it about is essential to any successful attempt to forecast the probable future. Thinking men will wish to study it closely. They will see in it the result not of a single, but of a compound moral force, which must be *resolved* before its significance can be fairly perceived. Such a moral *resolution of forces*, when it can be fully accomplished, will, we are persuaded, reveal a most marvelous economy and combination of popular aims and impulses made subservient to the purposes of the politician and

statesman; and, in the same manner, an economy and combination of the aims and purposes of human policy and statesmanship to work out the infinite designs of God.

Beginning with the simplest elements. The *people* of Italy have longed for the unification of Italy and the acquisition of old Rome, with all its venerable memories and inspiring associations, as their Capital. The radical party have long availed themselves of this feeling, and have fomented it, as a means of creating dissatisfaction with the *moderates*, the party at present in power; and, indeed, to some extent, with the *monarchy* itself. In the language of the *Italie* (September 15th) "the Italian democracy has seen in the question of the capital too good a pretext to perpetuate agitation, to permit it to escape them." At the same time the aim of the *revolutionists* was to secure the proclamation of a republic at Rome, which so far from completing the *Kingdom* of Italy by becoming its capital, should become the centre and base of revolutionary (as it has heretofore been of reactionary) influences against it, until it should absorb the Italian provinces from it, one by one, into a grand Roman Republic; and then, from the base of republican Italy, coöperating with the revolutionists of other nationalities, overthrow monarchy everywhere else, to construct on its ruins an universal European Republic, of which the Eternal City should be the Capital.

The victory of Sedan and the revolution in Paris, of course greatly inspirited this revolutionary party in Italy; but it also set Italy free to act. The aim of the Government at Florence was, therefore, *in the interest of their party*, to put themselves promptly at the head of the popular movement which would have otherwise driven them from power; and, *in the interests of the Monarchy*, to be beforehand with the revolutionists and occupy Rome before *they* were able to overthrow the Papal Government and proclaim the Roman Republic. The people with one voice acclaimed *any* hand which bore the standard that led them to Rome; no party could refuse to support the Government in accomplishing that which all parties (save indeed the insignificant *clerical* or *black* party) demanded; and inasmuch as Italy, by thus forestalling revolution, was acting in the interests of all monarchical Europe, no such power was at all disposed to prevent her.

The *people*, then, only aimed at the possession of their "natural

capital" and the unification of Italy; the *politicians* in power sought to give checkmate to the opposition, and, rising to a national statesmanship, to rescue the monarchy from grave peril of revolution. Of course, the former, having obtained *their* object, were satisfied and gave themselves up to rejoicing; the politicians knew perfectly well, that there were questions as grave in store, but were content to have overcome the present dangers;—they, too, had attained their immediate aims. To both of these classes the occupation of Rome was only, or at least chiefly, the acquisition of their capital and the defeat of the schemes of the revolutionists; and to them, therefore, the *questione Romana* was solved.

Setting aside, for the moment, all considerations of larger statemanship and of an overruling Providence, and stripping the subject of all pretence and of all diplomatic phraseology and looking upon it in its more popular and political point of view—*such* were the practical motives and considerations which, in the month of September, 1870, have combined to put an end to the separate political existence of the Papal principality. Such, in other words, were the passions and interests which were utilized by the Cabinet of Florence, and such their *political* purposes in so doing.

But there is, however, a class of statesmen whose range of thought is less restricted, and to whom the occupation of Rome is chiefly important, as putting an end to the Temporal Power of the Popes; a point of view which, although much less common in Italy, is that from which the outside world will of course chiefly regard it. The occupation of their capital was an act which concerned Italy alone; but when Italy put an end to the temporal papacy—even though it was only incidentally involved, not directly aimed at in her acts—it concerned all Christendom.

Let us now see how far Italian publicists took this view of the event.

The *Italie*, in the article to which reference has already been made, as early as September 6th, said, in speaking of the fall of the *temporal power*:—

"In presence of this grand event, the question of Rome, the capital, loses for an instant its importance. We also have wished that Rome should be the capital of Italy; but what matters the transfer of the bureaux of the Government from one city to another? * * * * If the fall of the temporal power is only regarded from the point of view of Italian interests, it would belittle the question. This event is destined to have an enormous in-

fluence upon all Catholicism, and especially upon the Latin peoples, upon those who have lived to the present time under the domination of prejudices the most opposed to the ideas of liberty and which the court of Rome has exerted itself to maintain by every means."

Again the *Nazione* says, upon the 19th inst. :—

"The politicians of the opposition have never considered the Roman question as it really is; they have always viewed it partially, as a matter of Italian interest only; and they have ever fallen into the error of considering, as principal, that which is secondary."

Even more explicit was the language of the same journal on the 17th in a leading article upon "*The Roman Question:*"—

"The completed nationality (of Italy) having been thus attained we shall find ourselves at once in the presence of the intricate problem of the coexistence of a free nation with the independent Papacy. The Roman question, we shall never sufficiently repeat it, rises before us entire and intact and more urgent than ever, the day we enter Rome. And more urgent and more unavoidable we have ourselves rendered it, inasmuch as we have stripped it of the heterogeneous elements in which the temporal power had enwrapped and confused it, giving to it false appearances, and surrounding it with interests entirely foreign to its essential character.

Let us go a step further, and see what issues appear to such writers as these to be involved in this Roman question, now that it has been thus disentangled from Italian politics and from all considerations growing out of the temporal power, and revealed in its purely ecclesiastical character:—

"The temporal power having fallen," says the *Italie*, "the Church herself will undergo insensibly a transformation, and will end, it is to be hoped, by identifying herself with progress and with human society."

Again:—

"We enter there," says the *Nazione*, "in the name of the great principles of civilization and modern progress (the very principles that is, which have just been solemnly condemned by a Papacy claiming infallibility, under penalty of eternal damnation) and our undertaking, instead of being useful to the world and glorious to us, would be ignominious to us and fatal to the world, if, not preserving due measure, we should, for the sake of concord with the Pope, abjure those principles which are the foundations of modern civilization; those liberties which are the reason of our existence as a nation."

And again, in connection with what has been quoted above of the comparative importance of the question of the Italian Capital, the same journal adds:—

"But to set forth to put an end to that worldly institution which has adulterated the Church and which, from the middle ages down, has ever disturbed the world, is to make a *crusade* in the name of civilization, and in which Italy, more than herself, represents humanity and whatever is noble and elevated in human thought."

Now, these two journals are perhaps the most able and enlightened and are certainly among the most influential of Florence, or, indeed, of Italy. These extracts prove that *they* are able to look upon the question of the day from the standpoint of a more enlarged statesmanship; and from such language as the above we may, therefore, form some estimate of the spirit with which Italian statesmanship is likely to deal with the *questione Romana* in its new phase, or rather with the true *questione Romana*, which the occupation of Rome has not solved, but only brought up for solution.

We rise now from the sphere of local politics into the wider and nobler atmospere of *œcumenical* statesmanship, and in so doing, we see that just as the passions and aims of the people of Italy were made subservient to the political and constitutional aims of the Italian Government, so these latter have, by the occupation of Rome, prepared the field for a more far-reaching human statesmanship; and more, subserved the all-wise and, as yet, only partially revealed Providence of God.

For the final overthrow of the temporal power of the Popes, which, though *not the direct object*, was indirectly but necessarily involved in the events which have been just described, was the consequence, not of the policy of the Italian Cabinet alone, but of the due combination with this policy of the Vatican Council and of the Franco-Prussian War.

More than all others the Pope himself contributed to bring about his own overthrow. A year ago he would probably have found defenders among the peoples who were still devoted to him; Austria, at least, bound by the Concordat, might perhaps have felt compelled to interfere in his defence. But the dogma of the personal infallibility, including as it did, and as it was frankly declared that it must do, such extreme claims as those of the Bull Unam Sanctam, and making the most reactionary principles of the Syllabus of 1864 *de fide*—both to be received and admitted *ex animo* under pain of everlasting damnation—was a formal declara-

on of war *a l'outrance*, on the part of the Roman Papacy, against ıe fundamental principles of constitutional government. It inicted a rude shock upon the devotion of the more intelligent and ıfluential Roman Catholics throughout Europe, and forced Roman atholic Governments, in simple self-defence, into hostility. .ustria renounced her Concordat; and in the hour of the extreme eril of the Papacy, Monsignore Nardi went, with unblushing efontery, from one of these thus defied governments to another, leading in vain that some arm should be interposed to save it.

Rome, then, has fallen; the temporal power has been swept way, and the spiritual power of the Pope has been deprived of ll its outer bulwarks, *in direct consequence* of the blasphemous ecree which the Papacy forced the Vatican Council to pronounce.

"The Pope," says the *Nazione* of Florence, "usurping in himself the auıority of the Episcopate, concentrating in himself all the authority of the hurch, and by the dogma of infallibility placing himself above every interest ıd every earthly power, aroused against himself those very religious interts which were heretofore called to defend him, and threatened civil society ıd the lay power in their most vital parts."

"To infallibility," says the *Neue Freie Presse* of Vienna, "succeeds overırow; to the Œcumenical Council succeeds the entry of the Italian troops ı the States of the Church. Events develop themselves with irresistible gic."

We thus come in full sight of the Providence of God. No uman foresight, no human wisdom planned the great combination f the party strife and the national aims of Italian politicians, ıe Vatican Council, and the Franco-German war. No human and restrained the warlike purposes of Paris and Berlin, permitng French and German Bishops to sit side by side and a French rmy to protect them, *until* the measure of Rome's iniquity was ıll and the step taken which should at last release the nations om their servitude, and the nobler Christians of the Roman atholic Church from their blind subserviency. No human power, hen this was done, instantly let loose a fearful war, which, among od's other inscrutable purposes, dissolved the Council and pened to Italy the gates of Rome. No human policy designed ır the republican party their part in this combination. No human atesmanship now keeps apart French and German Bishops, and istracts public attention, until Italy's own part in preparing the ay for the future shall have been accomplished. The Providence

of God has alone foreseen—has alone timed—has alone combined all these several agencies which have united so marvelously, as soon as Rome had taken the last fatal step, to strip her of the temporal power and place the spiritual Papacy itself on trial before Christendom. The infatuation of the Pope and the mad ambition of the Curia Romana, the strife of parties which raged around the Tuileries, the mutual distrust and jealousies of two great peoples, the intrigues of revolutionists, the shock of arms, and the self-protecting policy of the Italian Cabinet and the European powers, all, all have utilized and combined by an overruling Providence, which has been almost equally ignored by all those whom He has made His own instrumentalities.

The 20th of September, 1870, therefore, while it *solved* the Roman question in its merely popular or local aspect, while it, for the time being at all events, saved the principles of European constitutional monarchy from a threatened assault of red republicanism, only *revealed* more clearly, divested of all side issues, the true *Roman Question* of the age, which concerns not Italy alone, not European monarchies alone, but every free and enlightened nation in the world, to the extent that Roman Catholics are found within it. The question may be formulated thus: "How can a religious system, which condemns all the essential and fundamental principles of liberal governments, which claims the right to set human laws at naught and to withhold obedience from all constituted authorities at pleasure, and which exacts submission *ex animo* to these claims under penalty of eternal damnation, be reconciled with a free government which maintains that freedom of conscience in religion, is one of the dearest rights of a free people?"

Nothing remains now but to fulfill the work thus begun; to solve the question thus formulated. For a longer or a shorter period *statesmen* may seek for a solution; but it will be in vain. To them will be assigned the task of proving that the Papacy cannot be reconciled with free institutions or with the truest interests of modern society. To others, the holier work of demonstrating that neither can it be reconciled with the Word of God or with the purity of His Holy Catholic Church.

For this last and crowning work He has in reserve His Hèfèlès, and Swarzenburgs, Darboys and Kendricks, His Döllingers, Gratrys, and Hyacinthes, and others who will yet come forth in the fullness of His own appointed time.

ART. III.—DOCTOR CRAIK AND HIS REVIEWER.

In some respects, these two learned men differ only, in the terms employed, while in fact they mean to teach the same truths in regard to the Divine Life and the New Birth; but in other respects, their difference is essential and radical.

In the Reviewer's opening sentence, page 198, there is a serious omission, which, as it stands, makes the sentence untrue, but supplied it enunciates an accepted verity—"The *promised* Incarnation of the Son of God for the redemption of fallen man was the *beginning* of that great work of salvation, which he came to accomplish for our race." And the simple omission of this adjective has seemed to modify, to the same degree, truth in the whole of his Article. It affects premise and argument alike. This will appear as we get forward in the consideration of the more vital questions involved.

Page 203. Dr. Craik nowhere asserts that "men in their fallen condition are incapable of receiving the grace of God." On the contrary, he teaches that this grace has been communicated to all men, and so incorporated with their nature, by virtue of the Incarnation, that they may, by the use of those sufficient means of grace secured by the New Birth, bring forth the fruit of holiness." Nor has he indicated that "there is no residuum of a spiritual nature in man to whom the Spirit of God can join Himself." On the contrary, he affirms that the Spirit of God has "joined Himself" to the spiritual nature in man, and he adopts unreservedly the Reviewer's consequence, "and so by His grace, led men, themselves willingly following, to the reception of the Divine Life provided for them in Christ." We would say rather to the *conscious* reception, and *obedient* following of the Divine Life.

The only difference here between Dr. Craik and his Reviewer is, that the former calls this junction of the Spirit of God with the spirit of man, leading him to holy obedience, *the Divine Life in the soul*, and Dr. Buel rejects that *nomenclature*. Both affirm the same truth and simply differ about the *name* by which it should be expressed. The whole question then between them is, as in so many other differences, a mere "*war of words*." This identity of

view and diversity of expression is still more apparent elsewhere in the Article. As on page 211, where the Reviewer seems emphatically to affirm as his own belief "the universal gift, through Christ, of the spirit of life and light to operate upon depraved humanity," and at the same time denies that this is "the Divine Life in the soul of man." Now, as the Reviewer here states, Dr. Craik uniformly confounds these two things, and means by the Divine Life nothing more than the belief of the Reviewer—"the universal gift!" The dispute, therefore, is simply and purely about *words!* Dr. Craik demonstrated the same thing, when his book was much more harshly condemned by the Evangelicals. Whether this terminology is most appropriate, and better accords with a consistent body of Christian Theology, must be, for the Church hereafter to determine. It seems that the objection to it has come simply from the long prevalence of that Calvinistic system which maintained that the life of God was only imparted to those elect for whom alone it was destined, and in whom alone it is indestructible. Those who repudiate this dogma and all who reject the pseudo-gospels described by Dr. Craik, whether so-called Evangelicals or Churchmen, do virtually agree with him. The popular use in the Bible and in Christian writers, of the term Divine Life to express the practical living in accordance with that life—the actual following of Christ—does not militate against the scientific use of the term in its strict sense in systematic theology. It is like St. Paul's saying, "As many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the Sons of God." But the Bible, the Church, and our Reviewer affirm that all who are born again in Baptism are certainly "the sons of God." St. Paul here virtually affirms that unless they continue to be led by the Spirit of God, they are not the sons of God. No contradiction exists here. One proposition is a theological verity; the other, a practical test of holy living.

Nearly all the objectors to that view of the effect of the Incarnation upon human nature, set forth in this work, dwell much upon an imagined consequence of the fall, while it seems to us our author has faithfully employed the language of the Church and of the Bible in describing that portentous part in the history of man.

The Reviewer, as a writer in the Protestant Churchman had done before him, draws this extraordinary and gratuitous conclusion. He says:—"In a being in such a condition as described by

Dr. Craik there would be no place of entertainment for the Divine Spirit." It "would remove him as far from the possibility of Salvation, as if he were a beast, a stock, or a stone." See pages 203–4.

Again on page 213, he says: "on this view, it is hard to see what else human nature would be, but a mere unspiritual scene of action, in which the spirit of God alone enacts and produces the semblance of human virtue."

We have never been able to comprehend the force or meaning of these representations. We are not sufficiently acquainted with the essence of the human soul, or with the limits of the vivifying power of the Divine Spirit, to affirm, that human nature can be beyond the reach of influence—co-operating influence—from the Spirit. Certainly the Scriptures do not encourage us to set limits to the Spirit's power. A prophet once inquired, "Can these dry bones live?" And Jesus Himself said: "If these should hold their peace, the very stones would cry out."

It does not seem to us that Dr. Craik has even gone beyond the language of the Scriptures and the Church in describing the effect of the fall. He has simply affirmed, with the Scriptures and the Church, that to make this fallen creature capable of loving and doing good, of loving and seeking after God, the Spirit of God must move upon his heart, quicken his nature, and lead him, not by mechanical force upon brute nature, but by co-operation in and with the human faculties back to original righteousness, upward to God. The objection, therefore, to this view of the Divine operations, founded upon any supposable or imagined state of human nature, is to us unintelligible.

That the Revelation makes the Church and its ministrations the way of Salvation, is but the synonym of the fact, that the Church is a part of the Revelation, and that all to whom the Revelation comes, must accept this appointed way. But there is a world-wide field of phenomena outside of the Revelation which cannot be overlooked. The Revelation does not distinctly treat of these phenomena, nor does it state formally the being of God, or the immortality of the soul. It assumes these and many other verities, as the basis of its positive teaching. The work before us has simply formulated some of these all-pervading phenomena, which the human soul cannot ignore, and exhibited their relation to the

kingdom of God, and to the Revelation establishing that kingdom. And this has been done upon the very principles abundantly supplied by the Revelation itself. A scientific basis is thus presented for positive teachings.

To require that the Revelation shall be always nakedly presented to the minds of men, apart from the universal truths which itself assumes and recognizes, as a mere arbitrary and technical system, is to deal unfairly with the Gospel—is to put it out of relation with the thoughts, and hopes, and affections of men, and with the better spirit of the age in which we live. If the ministers of this Divine truth are determined thus to present it in severe isolation from all accordant truth, as a rigid, technical, and arbitrary system, it will be rejected, as they see, by a large class of the better minds of the world.

This Reviewer admits the phenomena, and devoutly believes in the universal influence of the Spirit of God upon the hearts of men, but earnestly protests against holding or presenting these truths in any sort of relation to Christianity, and insists, that men shall be forced to receive this Christianity, not as a component part of the beautiful harmony of the universe, but as an isolated fact unconnected with any other truth. Not so was the Revelation given. It was given to men with mind and capacity to see, and consider, and entertain all the phenomena of intelligent life, and character, and condition, presented in the world's history. And it contains the principles large, liberal, and pervading, by which its own special truths may be rationally connected with these universal phenomena of human character and destiny.

The reaction from this stern, narrow, and technical theology, has produced that wide-spread humanitarianism which is so painfully affecting the Christian faith. Because this theology contravenes and denies the plainest facts of observation and consciousness, men renounce the Christianity so presented, and undertake to build up another one-sided system out of these mere facts of observation and consciousness, disregarding revelation altogether. The work before us points out the Christian way of terminating this miserable conflict, by reconciling these universal facts with Christian dogma, and clearly exhibiting the relation between these facts and the supernatural revelation—the kingdom of God.

Our author, however, has written, unconsciously to himself, and

unfortunately for us, for another generation. His work is too consistent with itself, and too thoroughly in harmony with the truth, wherever found, not to meet with resistance from those long intrenched in the old terminologies of theological learning. But his grand and consistent presentation of Christian doctrine will live. No one can attentively peruse the work without discovering that it was not the intuitional inspiration of a month's labor, but was the gradual outgrowth of many years of careful investigation and profound thought.

But to return to more specific criticism:

In our first paragraph it was said that in some respects Dr. Craik and his Reviewer differ essentially and radically.

The former, for example, declares unequivocally that God did execute the penalty, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." On page 78 of his work, it is affirmed that this death was complete, in that it separated the offenders from their Maker —all guarantee of life here and hereafter was withdrawn—that, symbolic of that dissolution of the relation between them, the wretched twain were driven from the place of their communion with God, and flaming swords guarded the way to the tree of Life.

But whilst the dissolution was complete in itself, yet, in that same day, God restored through His promised Seed, enough of His Divine Image to Adam, to enable him and his posterity "to seek after God, if haply they might find Him." This restored capacity Dr. Craik calls the Divine Life, and the same coupled with Adam's fallen, depraved nature, St. John declares to be "the life" that was "the light of man," the light that "shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not."

The latter, however, intimates that the death penalty was not fully executed; that man became only bent from his legitimate course; that his faculties became warped, or diseased; and that his being, "very far from original righteousness" as defined in our Article, means that, and nothing else; and that the "residuum" of the Divine Image still remains as a ground-work on which the Spirit of God, in Jesus Christ, may build a super-structure, beautiful and god-like.

This "quam longissime" of our Article is simply intended to represent the condition of man as he stands in his naked naturalness, without going within the veil of his nature to analyze, under

the light of Revelation, what *it is* in him, that makes him only "very far gone from original righteousness," when the Divine decree of his death unto God had never been abrogated.

Dr. Craik, as a Christian philosopher, penetrated that veil, and under the light of God's word, discovered the phrase "very far gone from original righteousness," simply to imply that man's deadness in the first Adam was vivified by being coupled with a divine and living principle, imparted from the second through the promised Seed of the Woman; but as this light "shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not," there could be no possible expression more nearly in accord with the status of human nature unrenewed and unsanctified, than the "quam longissime" of our 9th Article.

Dr. Craik gives a distinct, clear, and positive character to this "residuum" of the Divine Image, and calls it a Divine Life—a germ implanted by virtue of the Incarnation of the second Adam, that exists in *every* soul, giving to each the influence of its co-existence with the evil nature, as far as natural obstructions or spiritual darkness may allow; and that as the soul yields itself to provisions of Salvation through Christ, these obstructions giving way, and the darkness dispersing, the Divine Life will grow up to the full measure of the stature of Christ.

His Reviewer, on the other hand, seems to have a most confused idea of this "residuum." He believes there must be something of the sort with which the Spirit of Grace may "join Himself;" but whether it be the remains of the unfallen, unsinful Adam, and thereby a failure on God's part to execute, that far, the death penalty; or whether it be some sort of spiritual receptivity imparted to endue man with capacity for receiving the Divine Life subsequent thereto he does not inform us. If he means the former, he reckons without authority. There is no intimation whatever of a failure on God's part to execute the death penalty, according to the decree, absolutely and entirely. On the other hand, Adam's shamefacedness—his lying apology—his utter banishment, all show plainly enough that the relationship between the created and the Creator was effectually and absolutely dissolved. If he means the latter, he could hardly explain to us from the Scriptures the nature and consistency of the Divine receptivity imparted by the

Spirit of Grace, without unconsciously falling into the very same groove of thought so admirably pursued in Dr. Craik's book.

The fact is, this receptivity is what Dr. C. properly calls the "Divine Life." *It is a life.* It is no passive thing, susceptible of *receiving only;* but it has an active, energetic existence, one that wrestles with the evil while co-existent with it, and even though at times prostrated and helpless as a worm beneath the heel of a giant, it still writhes, ere its life goes out, and the man becomes a fiend or devil.

In regard to the New Birth, Dr. Craik confines it, as does our Reviewer, to Baptism. The former, however, makes Baptism the sacramental doorway of a life already existing unto the kingdom of God—there to find appliances suited to its growth and perfection for the Master's use. The latter makes Baptism not a doorway, but the act of fecundation, as it were, of the Holy Ghost, and the Consecrated Water, and the Divine Life in embryo, begins *only then;* and its development is subsequently promoted as in the former case. If such were the fact, our Lord would have used the word "fecundation" and not "born," in the formulary He proposed to Nicodemus. There would be no such thing as "a new birth unto righteousness," or the being "born of water and of the Spirit." It would be an utter misapplication of language. All this, however, will appear in clearer light, as we progress with a more systematic presentation of the scientific and logical arrangement found on the work of our learned author.

Two huge systems of error in regard to the Divine Life, and to the New Birth, pervade the religious world. Their fundamental character is identical; but in their development, they diverge as far apart as it is possible.

One system teaches that the Divine Life in the soul begins with conversion, and that conversion and regeneration are the same, and that therefore conversion is the beginning of the Divine Life, and before *non erat.*

The other system is that which is known as the *opus operatum* of the Roman Church, teaching that the administration of Baptism by the act itself dates the beginning of the new life—that there was a time anterior to this sacrament, in adult or infant, when there was no divine life in the soul—nothing of God's image to be found!

Our Reviewer, however, does not claim any virtue, like the Romanist, for the bare rite of Baptism, apart from repentance and faith. But like him, he places the beginning of the Divine Life at the *font;* and, therefore, whatever may invalidate the dogmatic teaching of the one, must likewise impair that of the other.

The objections to these two systems—the popular theology as to conversion, and the Roman dogma as to regeneration—so far as the fundamental principle goes, are the same, and they both must stand or fall together.

Among the passages of Scripture that seem to teach depravity uncoupled with any co-existent and divine principle, and, therefore, to license the systems we are animadverting upon, are such as these: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me. The whole head is sick and the whole heart is faint." "Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart is only evil continually." Perhaps these are as strong passages as may be found that look to total depravity as the soul's condition before that point of conversion or baptism which is claimed as the beginning of the Divine Life, and yet they are not sufficient, in opposition to *all observation and experience* to settle the question. Indeed, it is not difficult to employ such strong affirmations when speaking of man's unrenewed and unsanctified condition, while the doctrine of the Divine Life as taught by our author is taken for granted. Although we are conceived in sin and born in iniquity, yet, as the finest diamond may be embedded in the foulest earth, so the image of God—the Divine Life, imparted to the First Adam by virtue of the promised Incarnation of the second, and imparted to his posterity by virtue of the actual Incarnation of the Lord of Glory, may be hidden in the transmission from father to son, though corrupt human nature may overlie it, and be wrapt about it! As to other passages, they are simply strongly expressive of our ruined state—its utter proneness to evil, but without implying that the Divine Image is utterly wanting, or that no germ of a holier life remains somewhere and somehow hidden in the soul's dark depths.

The Scripture, however, that bears directly upon the Divine Life as co-existent with corrupt human nature, is full and pointed.

At the risk of being tedious, a repetition of illustration seems necessary to the argument.

We hold that God did faithfully fulfill His word and execute the death penalty upon Adam and Eve. On the day of disobedience all guarantee of life was withdrawn—soul and body were subjected at once to decay and death—the soul destined to the death of the fallen angels—a forfeiture of all God's blessed image—the body was destined to dissolution, to be restored no more forever. And had there been no redeeming power provided then, the lapse would have been utter and irretrievable ruin, and no tracings of the Divine Life or Image could have been discovered in soul or body. But a Redeemer had been provided before the world was. It is written "the Lamb of God was slain *before* the foundation of the world." And Jesus Himself said, "*before* Abraham was. I AM." And St. John declared that "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. In Him was Life, and the Life was the light of men." And in the very words of the curse, this great fact of Christ's eternal sonship as the world's redeeming power before the fall, was, that He existed, as it were, *anticipatory of that fatal event.* In the curse, God said to the serpent, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed—it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise its heel." Now it is clear that the Seed of the Woman was none other than Christ, the Lord, co-eternal with the Father, and co-equal in the Godhead, yet to accomplish the high ends of God's moral universe, in the fullness of time, He has to be born of a woman, and manifest in the flesh.

The enmity that was to, and actually does subsist between, the devil and all his works and agencies, on the one hand, and Christ, the Seed of the Woman, and all His Divine and holy adjuncts, on the other, is a fact as clear as the sun.

The struggle between right and wrong—purity and impurity—honor and shame, virtue and vice, is the history of the race. The individual as well as the national life of all Adam's descendants might testify to this fact as indisputable.

The Apostle recognizes the same fact when speaking of the Gentiles as being a law unto themselves:

"For when the Gentiles," saith he, "which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and

their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."

These words were said of the heathen utterly beyond the pale of Christian influence. The same principles apply, of course, to all heathen, similarily situated—those who have never known, and will never know the gospel, nor anything as to Christian baptism or conversion. The struggle here is clearly drawn by St. Paul as between the flesh and the spirit—the natural man, and the Divine Life co-existent along with the carnal nature."

But our Reviewer, page 212, intimates that conscience is a *natural power;* and that it was so exercised by the heathen in the passage above quoted. And so is any other moral quality a natural power; but were it not united to that quickening Life imparted to all men, there would be no law written on the heathen's heart by the finger of God. The fact of a heathen or any other man, having a conscience sensitive to wrong-doing and appreciative of right, is enough to show that it is the work of God's grace—that it is the Divine Life bursting, its embryo hiding-place, and developing and asserting for itself a higher, nobler existence! And how beautifully does all this harmonize with St. Paul's affirmation, that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit."

Divine Life is the purchase of "the Lamb that was slain before the foundation of the world." Divine Life, through the last Adam, who "was made a quickening spirit," has been quickened along with the natural fœtus in every womb; and every child born into the world has, by virtue of Christ's Incarnation, in its soul and body, the germ of an immortal nature.

The Apostle, in writing to his converts, deals in axiomatic truths, but in applying them to the heart-struggles in the experience of his Christian disciples, he by no means gives us to understand that he regards them as limited only to such cases. The fact is, he employed them as truisms, familiar to the universal consciousness of men. He speaks of "the spirit warring against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit." He declares also that "there is a law in our members warring against the law of the mind" —that "when we would do good, evil is present with us."

Now, whence comes this conflict—this perpetual soul-struggle?

It is clear the character of the two is as opposite as light and darkness, and that they are utterly irreconcilable antagonists—one is divine; the other unholy—one God-like; the other Devil-like, both within the same breast, and both peculiar to every soul that has come into the world. Whence came they? There is no dispute as to the source of the evil-force; but whence the good one? Is it a mere passive fragment of the Divine Image left in the general rubbish and ruin of man's fall? But it is *not passive*—it is an intense *activity*. It must, therefore, be that there is coupled with man's corrupt nature, and in conflict with it, a divine energy—a moral force, God-given—a divine life co-eval with the soul itself, quickened by the second Adam who "was made a quickening spirit"—a spirit that was before Abraham—that existed in the "Seed" of the first prophecy, that became the life-restoring and life-giving power to the soul.

This Divine Life is the hidden leaven to soul and body. Under the Holy Ghost it warms into an active, soul-energizing principle, that may permeate and pervade the whole man. It is this that may give the soul an immortality of peace:

> "The soul, of origin divine
> God's glorious image—freed from clay,
> In Heaven's eternal sphere shall shine,
> A star of day."

It is the Divine Life given unto men, by virtue of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, which guarantees the resurrection of the body. And this line of argument, St. Paul has grandly developed, in his 15th Chapter of First Corinthians.

We cannot close this scriptural argument, however, without an illustration from one class of our Lord's miracles—the cure of lepers. It is patent to all Bible readers that the leper was ever taken as a fit illustration of sin, and its dire effects. The leper who came to Jesus, crying, "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean," was in the last stages of dreadful disease. It is said the blessed Lord put forth his hand and touched him, and he was healed.

There was that leper—a mere mass of corruption, but within him was his natural life, still pulsating with energy, and the blood, however corrupt, still coursed its paths through the arterial

system! His life-stamina were undestroyed; there was that left in him, on which the healing power of Christ might work. All was corrupt but *that*—dead but *that*. A living principle was in union with that putrid body; and on that, the Divine Physician wrought out the perfect cure of the whole man. So is it spiritually. Although the heart may be corrupt, and desperately wicked—there is a divine life in every soul, and with this, the Holy Ghost applying the blood of Christ, may afford healing virtue to the whole man.

One more scriptural illustration strangely misapplied by our learned Reviewer, on page 205. "*To as many as received Him, gave He power to become the Sons of God.*" Because this passage of holy writ is from the pen of "the disciple who spoke from the bosom of the Lord Himself," our Reviewer gives it especial credence, and dwells upon it, as an unanswerable objection against Doctor Craik's view of the Divine Life. Now, it is clear, one or the other of us utterly mis-construes these apostolic words. Had our Reviewer not used them for his own purposes, it is not unlikely that the present writer would have selected them, in order to substantiate the portions of his author. Be that as it may, we must insist upon the introductory clause, "*to as many as received Him,*" to mean nothing else than that all men had some sort of power residing in them to receive the Son of God. You would not consider a friend accountable for refusing to hold out his hand for a gift when his body was armless, nor could he accept a gift, however perfect his limbs, unless he possessed some sort of inherent power to move the muscles of his hand. "To as many as received Him" therefore implies the Divine Life in man—that Divine capacity which can distinguish and choose the good from the evil; and "to them who are exercised thereby," does God give the "power"—that is, the privilege—the immunity—to become the Sons of God in Baptism—"members of Christ, children of God and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven."

To conclude the argument for the Divine Life as co-existent with corrupt nature, we might array a number of passages from the early Christian writers, to show that the doctrine is not only scriptural but catholic. Dr. Craik has given two or three admirable quotations from Justin Martyr, Tertullian and Clemens Alexdrinus. See pages 169–70. It must suffice here to observe that

while there may not be found any such terminology as the "Divine Life" in the sense used by our Author, in the ancient testimonies, yet, the same principle is abundantly taught, not formulated under any specific nomenclature, and the same idea prevails with scarcely an exception. See Weckham's celebrated "Synopsis of baptism, regeneration, conversion, &c., and other kindred subjects in the original tongues by the fathers and other writers from the time of our Saviour to the end of the fourth century."

We come now to consider conversion in its relation to the Divine Life.

Conversion is the turning of a man's life-character to God.

It may be undisputably held, from what has gone before, that it were impossible for a man to turn unto the Lord, had he no capacity anteriorly existing so to do, any more than he could turn his body into a path of safety without inherent powers of locomotion. This capacity to turn unto the Lord may be quickened by God's Spirit operating directly, or through Providence, or through the appointed means of calling sinners to repentance, and thus, as it were, affording stimuli to the Divine Life, the better to enable the soul, aroused to its duty, to turn away from sin, and be renewed in the spirit of the mind.

But the Divine Life does exist in a man's soul to do many good and blessed things, and yet the man may be unturned—unconverted to God. A precious gem though hidden in the rubbish, may reveal here and there an angle, flashing in the sunlight. Some men seem to have been born better than others, or in other words, some have the divine life in a degree more manifest than it exists in others; and yet in neither one nor the other class, is it of any avail, unless it "bears fruit unto holiness." The talent tied in the napkin brought only condemnation to its owner; but to him whose talents had multiplied—had "brought forth fruit"—to him was salvation come.

"All have sinned and come short of the glory of God," is a divine truism which no example in actual life, however praiseworthy, can annul or disprove. It must needs be, therefore, that as many as are called must come to Christ, *actually* renouncing the devil and his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world and all the deceitful lusts of the flesh. *And this is conversion.* It may be in one man, more absolute and visible than in another; but, be

it less or more, whether vice or virtue, has predominated in his previous life—the whole man is to be turned—converted to God in his life-character, to which he but gives outward expression in the vow of renunciation at *his Baptism.*

By this we may rightly infer that conversion is one thing—the new birth in baptism another.

A man baptized in his infancy, and wandering in forbidden paths, must repent and turn to God, as the prodigal to his father's home. He must be converted, and become again as a little child else he can never see his Lord in peace.

An unbaptized man, but one who is aroused to his duty, and longs to become "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven," and who has resolved "to lead a new life, following the commandments of God," may be, and is a truly converted man, but he is still unborn into Christ's blessed Kingdom; and before his conversion can avail for him any lasting good in the economy of grace, he must be born again; "for except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

Nicodemus was just such a character; converted from the error of his way, he sought the Master eagerly, and earnestly inquired how he might become one of His followers, a member of His society, a subject of His Kingdom. But devoted and converted as he was, the Master answered him, "Ye must be born again!" And in further explanation of it, He set forth a universal rule for him and all others who would enter His Kingdom on earth and in Heaven—"Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

This Baptism "of water and of the Spirit" is the only introduction, therefore, into Christ's Kingdom: and our Lord called it the being "born again," and St. Paul "the washing of regeneration."

Now, what is the relation of this new birth to the Divine Life? Why the need of Baptism if a Divine Life existed in the soul before? For the same reason that physical birth is necessary to the antenatal life in the mother's womb. Life is there perfect in itself, but unborn of the flesh, it can never develop in rational being to the stature of manhood. It requires another sphere of existence—one of space, and light, and air; and such hath nature's

God provided: and the introduction into that sphere is by physical birth.

In like manner, the Divine Life requires for its perfect development, a new, higher and holier sphere. It requires, however much it may have been quickened into a more energetic existence, intimate fellowship with Christ, membership in His society, citizenship in His commonwealth—called *Ἐκκλησία θεοῦ*—in which His Spirit reigns as He does not in the world, to sanctify and invigorate even the Divine Life, through offices, ordinances, sacraments, and services, that the Life may grow up to the fullness of the stature of Christ.

That we may have a clearer understanding of this doctrine of baptismal regeneration, we will briefly consider the two offices with which Baptism is invested.

These offices are, *first*, the remission of sins, and *secondly*, the guarantee to the subject, of all the privileges and benefits in the Kingdom of Grace.

In regard to remission of sins by any formal or priestly act, or sacrament, the popular theology has created such a prejudice in the minds of many persons, even in the Church, that, losing sight of *article and creed*, they openly express their dissent. It does not occur to them, that if a temporal power may determine a formal act, and appoint a fitting occasion for the reprieve, or the pardon of an offender, surely God's ability, willingness, or preference to remit sin at a time and under circumstances of His own arrangement, ought not to be called in question. This office in Baptism is *His* plan for the authoritative remission of sin, and not man's. It is ours to accept His Word and will. The formulary of salvation in Christ was annunciated through the inspired lips of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost—"Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Repentance, another name here for conversion, must ever *precede* the grant of forgiveness, else Baptism becomes a birth of the water, but not of the Spirit—an empty ceremonial!

But to the penitent and contrite heart, God hath appointed a time and circumstance when in a formal, significant, and sacramental manner, He proposes to grant "remission of sins."

A converted and penitent man may enjoy God's loving favor, who has a desire to enter His Kingdom by formal remission of sin,

but who lacks the opportunity. A pardoned outlaw who has laid down his arms under an amnesty-proclamation, enjoys the blessings and protection of the kingdom, to a certain extent, though the opportunity may not have been afforded him to seal his repentance in an oath of allegiance, and to receive in return his acquittal duly signed and sealed by proper authority.

A body of land may have been purchased and paid for, and may be occupied without the title passing in due form into the hands of the purchaser. But the privileges and the benefits of the land, to a certain extent, are not denied the purchaser, though the title deed be not yet in his own name. But in the eye of the law the outlaw is still unpardoned, and the occupant still an alien in his own home, until the authoritative and formal acts in both cases, make the acquittal of the one complete, and the ownership of the other an unquestioned fact.

We adduce these familiar illustrations to afford a clearer understanding of the character and importance of Baptism as an authoritative act for the forgiveness of sin, original and actual.

And in conformity with this, we have not only the answer of St. Peter to the multitude pricked to the heart, but we have, subsequently, the case of Saul of Tarsus, precisely in accord with St. Peter's formulary of salvation. He was a repentant and converted man for three days at Damascus, before he was born of "water and of the Spirit." Ananias said to him while still on his knees in prayer, "Brother Saul, arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins!" It was not until after his Baptism that he began to preach Christ unto the people. This was that divine and formal acquittal of the criminal Saul that enabled him to go forth in "the liberty wherewithal Christ had made him free." And thus it is, we declare in our Creed—"*I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.*"

How close does the analogy of the new birth in Baptism bear to the old birth in nature! As the new born child is washed from its defilements, that it may be fitted for the growth and development of the natural man, so does God in the new birth in Baptism, symbolically and outwardly by water, and really and inwardly by the Holy Ghost, *applying Christ's blood* "wash away" our sins. In infancy, God's Spirit under the symbol of water, remits original sin —in adult age, under the symbol of water, (if repentance and

ith precede the sacrament) God's Holy Spirit, *applying Christ's ood*, remits both original and actual transgression. As before inmated, as the new born child requires cleansing for health and owth, so does the child of grace, *need "the washing of regenerm," that in the Kingdom of God he may grow up a perfect man Christ Jesus, our Lord.*

As the natural man is subject to perpetual bodily defilement, d needs the labor of cleansing with which from time to time, to rify the outer man, so hath God ordained, knowing the frailties his children, that there be ever recurring means by which the tual and repeated sins of His people may be remitted. And ese ordinances of re-iterated remission, are confirmation, priestly bsolution, and the oft-repeated sacrament of the Lord's Supper, hereby we obtain, by virtue of Christ's blood, "remission of r sins" and "other benefits of His Passion."

Let it be distinctly noted that in the illustrations drawn from e physical birth for the spiritual, we have simply amplified legimately and naturally, the favorite simile employed by our blessed ord with which he would teach us the way and manner of enterg His Kingdom.

Inadvertently, we have already encroached upon the limits of e second office, with which the new birth in Baptism is invested —viz.: the guarantee of the privileges and benefits of Christ's ingdom. This is a theme, however, alike limitless and exhaustss.

The whole family of earth and heaven is one: the Church militnt and the Church triumphant are separated but by a veil. his is that kingdom so often illustrated by metaphor and parable, *nd which we enter at our Baptism.* The whole is impregnated by od's Holy Spirit, and in the heavenly sphere of it, Jesus sits enroned as our King Immanuel—God with us in both earth and eaven. Within this realm of light, and love and grace, are not nly the ordinances and rites—the Priesthood and the Revealed Word, but within this realm, countless millions of the sainted dead, nd the angel host, do dwell, as ministers of God's helping grace, ielding and guiding, warning and comforting—"Sent forth," ith the Apostles, "to minister to them who shall be heirs of alvation."

ART. IV.—BISHOP RAVENSCROFT.

It is now just forty years since the first Bishop of North Carolina ended his brief Episcopate in death.

Elected in 1823, and consecrated the same year, he entered immediately upon his High Pastoral office, and with a success which, alas for the Church! was of scarcely seven years' duration. His course was like that of the meteor, suddenly—appearing, bright, and soon ending in darkness; but still more resembled that of the sun which sets not until it has first given warmth and fruitfulness to the earth.

The "Memoir" of Bishop Ravenscroft, prefixed to his two volumes of sermons, though written by one of the most finished scholars of the South,* was necessarily imperfect, from the want of those many little details and private marks of character which more than the most labored biography serve to individualize the man. It is proposed, in this sketch, by one, who more than any other of his clergy was admitted to his confidence, not to say affection, to set forth that great and good Bishop just as he was, or as he appeared to the writer's view, during an intimacy commencing previous to his consecration and ending only at the side of his death-bed.

The name "Ravenscroft" is undoubtedly of German origin. On a visit to a colony of that people in the valley of Virginia, soon after he took orders, he was told by one of their patriarchal men that he did not spell his name rightly; that it should be Ravenscrof*dt*.

Of the Bishop's parents but little is known. He is said to have borne a strong resemblance to his mother, in feature, as well as in the character of his mind. His birth (in 1776) was in the southern portion of the city of Petersburg, Va., for a long time, if not now, known by the name of "Ravenscroft," and once the property of the family. When he was but a few months old his father, in order to avoid the political convulsions then threatening the country, moved back to his former residence in the south of Scotland, and soon afterwards died. Very little is known of the son's boyhood, except

* The late Hon. Walher Anderson, Chief Justice of Florida.

that he lived for some time with an old aunt while attending an excellent classical school in Northumberland. It was while at this school, and in the twelfth year of his age, that he was the subject of one of those strange appearances which can be as little questioned as accounted for. He was playing marbles, with his school-fellows, in the middle of the day, at the side of a hedge. In the midst of the game he distinctly saw his aunt walking towards him on the top of the hedge. After approaching very near to him she suddenly disappeared. Before he could recover from his wonder and alarm a servant of the family rode hastily up to inform him that his aunt, whom he supposed to be in perfect health, had suddenly died. This story the writer received from the Bishop's own lips. Another incident of his boyhood is not without interest, inasmuch as it illustrates that Providence which so kindly preserves our childhood amid dangers both seen and unseen. He was in his ninth year, and playing in front of his mother's dwelling, when a large bull suddenly broke into the yard and ran after him. Before he could reach the house the furious creature overtook him, and getting him between his horns endeavored to gore him first with one, then with the other, until the screams of the child brought the servants to his relief. He added that the prints of those horns were distinctly visible on the side of the house when he left Scotland eight years afterward.

On returning to this country to look after his large estate, he entered "William and Mary College;" but before his graduation he was enticed from his books by the charms of a lady whom he soon after married, and of whom he always spoke in terms of the warmest affection, and of the highest admiration for her piety and many virtues. Being the possessor of a large fortune and of a commanding intellect, he soon became a leading spirit in all the active sports and public amusements which occupied so much of the life of the more wealthy and aristocratic sons of Virginia at that day. Few were more conspicuous than he on the race-course, at the card-table, or around the cock-pit. And he once confessed to the writer, with a heavy sigh, that he had one day gone upon the race-field prepared to horse-whip and, if resisted, to shoot down a fellow-sportsman; a man who afterwards became a distinguished citizen of another State. By the ordering

of a kind Providence his intended victim was that day absent from his usual place, a thing observed by all, and never accounted for. It was not from any sense of fear, for that man was as insensible to such a feeling as Mr. Ravenscroft himself, who could see in it nothing but the preserving and restraining hand of God, extended in mercy to his soul. But the worst practice to which he, with his godless companions, was addicted, was that of profane swearing. In speaking of this, after he became a Bishop, a lady of Petersburg, whose doors were ever open to him, remarked to the writer that, although at that day oaths were in every gentleman's mouth, in the parlor as well as in the street, yet when Mr. Ravenscroft swore she "trembled."

It is with anything but pleasure that these sins of his early life are brought to view. Much as they may shock the pious and sensitive mind of the present day, to no one could the thought of them bring more pain than to himself. The writer well remembers, on first visiting him, and alluding to his great change of life, how his deep-toned voice trembled with emotion as he said: "Forty years, sir, was I an outrageous and outbreaking sinner; and it is only by the grace of God that I am what I am."

But painful as it may be to think of those misspent and God-defying years, it is wonderful to see how out of such a course of sin there could be anything extracted that might give increased power to his future ministry. But this he freely acknowledged one day, in the following manner to one of his clergy:

"Brother G., I have one great advantage over you." The answer was, "Not *one* only, Bishop, but a good many."

"Pshaw! no compliments. I mean this, that whereas *you* were brought up in the fear of God, and in ignorance of the great wickedness that is going on in the world, I know all about the sinner's ways, and can therefore track the scoundrels into all their dens and hiding-places, and strip them of their self-deceits and refuges of lies."

When asked how his thoughts were first turned to the subject of religion, he answered that, under God, he owed it to his excellent wife. When, after many weeks of inexcusable absence, he would return home, she would invariably meet him in a gentle and lovely spirit, and make no allusion whatever to his neglect of her, or to the

manner in which his time had been spent. This truly Christian forbearance and sweetness of temper, exhibited again and again, led him, at length, to ask himself, "What can be the cause? Why does not the woman reproach and revile me, as I deserve? This is not *natural.* Where does it come from?" In this way he for some time vainly questioned with himself, while his proud spirit was unwilling to seek the solution from her own lips. He remembered, however, that her daily companion was her Bible, and that he had often surprised her in reading it, when he supposed her to be otherwise engaged. Thinking that he might *there* find the wonder explained, he resolved to become himself a reader of the Scriptures. In that divine mirror he soon saw what a sinner he was, and that his only hope for pardon and salvation lay in a thorough and speedy change of life. Under this imperfect view of his case he resolved that he would, as he expressed it, "try to become a better man, by breaking off first one sin, and then another, until he had made himself a good Christian." Here the writer will use his own words, as well as he can recall them; and he must say that they are, and ever will be, deeply engraved on his memory:

"Knowing that profane swearing was my besetting sin I determined to *take the bull by the horns*, and master *that* first. Accordingly, by great effort, I kept myself from it, first for a day or two, then for a week or more, and at length for full three weeks. By this time I began to think of taking up another sin, and in like manner, putting *it* under foot, when one day, being absent from home, under some slight provocation, my old habit returned upon me with a pent-up force, and my oaths were shocking even to myself. Never, in my life, was my pride more humbled and my weakness so plainly set before me. In deep mortification of spirit I hastened home, and, without even speaking to my wife, shut myself within my library, and threw myself upon my face on the bed, in an agony of contending feelings that words cannot describe."

Here he seemed disposed to stop, but being urged to go on, added:

"What passed in that hour I cannot tell you, my good brother, or any other man; but this I will say, that before I left that bed God was pleased, of his abounding mercy, to reveal me to myself, to show me that I had been standing upon the foundation of my own strength, and with my own arm beating down my sins; to convince me what a vain work it was, and to point me to the true and only source of salvation from the guilt as well as the power of my sins. From that hour no oath has ever passed these lips, nor have I felt the least temptation to swear."

Upon being asked why he was so unwilling to disclose what had passed within that hour, he said that what is called the "religious experience" of believers is so widely different that it is unsafe to make one the test of another; and that, occasionally, there is, at the turning point of a man's religious convictions, something so marked and out of the common track, as to make it unwise and even dangerous to publish it, lest others should look for the same in their struggles to renounce the world, and turn to God.

Soon after his change of life became known, it was widely reported that his conversion was brought about by the over-heard prayers of an old negro servant whom he had just cruelly chastised. There was, of course, not a word of truth in this sensational story; but it was nevertheless extensively circulated, and believed at the time, although it was well known to his neighbors and friends that he treated his servants with almost a criminal indulgence.

His residence in Mecklenburg County being remote from any settled place of worship, he was thankful for the occasional visits to the neighborhood of a worthy Minister of the Reformed Methodist denomination, and even accompanied him through several of his appointments, helping him with an occasional exhortation or prayer. Whilst thus zealously engaged, it pleased God to incline him to devote himself wholly to the work of the Ministry. But where should he go? The number of conflicting sects around him was almost as great as at the present day, each claiming to preach a purer Gospel than the rest, and all striving to get him into their ranks. Of the One Apostolic Church of Christ little indeed was then known in Virginia. He had, while at "William and Mary," and during his subsequent married life, learned something of the Protestant Episcopal Church; but, alas! he had learned, only to despise it. This was doubtless owing, in part, to his early Scotch-Presbyterian training; but mainly to the worldly, not to say godless, lives of many both of the clergy and laity of that Church whom he saw around him. It is well known that at the beginning of the present century that Church was at the lowest point of depression. It had yet to show its true character in the lives and labors of such men as Bishops Moore and Meade and the saintly Nicholas Cobbs. When Mr. Ravenscroft, therefore, resolved to

search out for himself an altar at which he might serve, it was with a truly honest mind, and with a firm determination to follow wherever his convictions might lead him; but, as he confessed to the writer, he had a lingering prejudice against the Episcopal Church, and a kind of presentiment that any other would be that of his choice. With the Bible as his chief guide he came out nevertheless from that examination, to use his own words, "as thorough a Churchman" as ever he was afterwards; viz., as firmly rooted in catholic principles, although not so able to defend them. When asked in what parts of the Bible he saw most plainly the distinguishing features of that Church, he answered promptly: "Everywhere, but especially in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus."

After receiving both Deacon's and Priest's Orders at the hands of Bishop Moore, he preached at several small places within the county, and built, principally, with his own means, a plain church about three miles distant from his residence. In this humble sphere he continued to serve for some years, though sought after by several parishes, and invited by Bishop Moore to become his assistant in the Monumental Church in Richmond.

While thus content to labor in one of the obscurest corners of his Master's vineyard he was unexpectedly called to the chief pastorship of the young but important Diocese of North Carolina.

When the Convention of that Diocese met in Salisbury, in April, 1823, to elect their first Bishop, the minds of very few, either of clergy or laity, were centred upon any one individual. That truly godly man, the Rev. Adam Empie D. D., of St. James' Church, Wilmington, was, in a good measure, the favorite of the clergy, but not sufficiently so of the laity. When, as President of the Convention, he announced that the moment had come for entering into the election, there was a pause of some length, and the eyes of several of both clergy and laity were turned on the writer, then the youngest of the clergy, as if expecting him to make a nomination. Having been a pupil of the good President, and allied to him also by family ties, it was truly painful to him to pass by his many claims and propose the name of another. That youthful clergyman had never before spoken in Convention, and was, therefore, startled at the sound of his own voice as he mustered courage enough to nominate the Rev. John Stark

RAVENSCROFT of the Diocese of Virginia. The inquiry soon arose on all sides, "Who is Mr. Ravenscroft?" It was ascertained that not six members of that Convention had ever heard of him; two only had once seen him; and one of those two had heard him preach; and yet, after a few stammering words from the nominator, he received the unanimous vote of the Convention. This detail, however needless it may appear to some, will be regarded by others as one of those unlooked-for orderings of Providence out of which have grown, and are daily growing, some of the richest blessings of the Church.

The scene which occurred at the moment when the election of Mr. Ravenscroft was announced to him has elsewhere been described by the writer, but may well bear to be repeated in this sketch, intended, as it is, to portray some of the more peculiar features of his character.

To the same young Brother who had the honor of nominating him was allowed the gratification of informing him of his election. The account of it may best be given, as at first, in his own words:

"When I rode up to his humble dwelling he met me, as usual, with both hands extended, saying, 'Why, brother G., what has brought you here?' To this I answered, in the same vein, that it was not usual for one gentleman to ask another what had brought him to his house. 'Well, well,' he said, 'come in, come in, my wife has a nice cup of tea for you.' When tea was over, he drew his chair close to mine, and laying his hand on my knee, said, 'But, come, tell me, what brings this God-send of a visit to me?' Without replying, I placed in his hands the certificate of his election. and watched his countenance as he read it with an incredulous and startled look. When at length he fully comprehended its purport, he dropped it in his lap with a deep groan. His wife started at the sound, looking painfully at me to know what was the matter. With a smile and a gentle motion of my hand I quieted her fears, and requested her to say nothing. After a few moments of impressive silence he arose and paced the room several times, groaning at every turn, as if some heavy calamity had befallen him. At length, approaching his wife, he laid the letter in her lap, and retired to the darkness and solitude of his study;—solitude, so far as any human presence was concerned, but in manifest intercourse with Him who alone can direct and rule the heart. After the absence of a half hour he returned with a composed countenance, and standing before me, said: 'Brother G., God's hand is in this thing; I dare not resist it.' The next day I bore his letter of acceptance to a rejoicing Diocese."

How unlike was this to the conduct of some clergymen who ambitiously court the distinction of the Episcopal Office, and of others who as inexcusably shrink from its responsibility, though called to it by the unsought suffrage of their brethren.

In the fall of that year he made his first visitation of the Diocese, attracting many by the affability of his manner, others by his power in the desk and the pulpit, and rejoicing the heart of every Churchman at seeing how graciously God had provided for their spiritual need. Alas, that these visitations should have been so few! Six times did he pass through his Diocese, from mountain to sea-board, in all weathers, and over the roughest roads. When the opening of the seventh spring invited him to a renewal of his labors it found him upon his last bed. For three years his health had been gradually giving way, and on the 5th of March, 1830, he slept in death, in the city of Raleigh, under the roof of a friend * who had been to him even as a son and a brother.

In person Bishop Ravenscroft was of a commanding figure, so much so as to attract attention wherever he moved. In answer to the question sometimes asked him as to his height, his reply was, "I am just six feet in my stockings." To this noble stature were added limbs finely rounded and well proportioned, with not an ounce of superfluous flesh upon them. From what is told us of Washington they might have been cast in the same mould, both physically and as regards many traits of mind and manner also. His voice was deep and solemn, and when excited, like the roar of a lion. There are some now living who can remember how, in answer to the questions put to him at the time of his consecration in St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia, his deep-toned voice seemed to shake those venerable walls, and to impress the congregation with an almost painful awe. His head was small in proportion to his general size, with a rather narrow forehead, high cheek-bones, and a projecting brow. His eyebrows, which he himself called his "dormer windows," were so large and prominent as completely to shade the eyes, and give them the appearance of being of a dark color, when, in reality, they were a greyish blue, and quite inexpressive, if not dull, when their possessor was silent; but kindling with the lightning's flash when accompanying the roar of his voice.

* Gavin Hogg.

In dress he was simple, plain, and unvarying. Its general style was that of a well-born English gentleman of a century ago. Nothing could have induced him to wear the modern pantaloon. A quaker-like coat, and knee-breeches, with boots and worsted stockings in the winter, and shoes and silk stockings in warm weather constituted his daily and uniform apparel. His gait was firm, measured, and it might almost be said, majestic, and as such truly indicative of his character. On all occasions he seemed to bear himself with such unusual dignity that he could scarcely cross a room without drawing all eyes upon him. The year before his death the writer was with him at the General Convention in Philadelphia, and being desirous of obtaining a good likeness of him, took him to the studios of several of the most approved portrait painters, by way of selecting the most skillful. At each place his striking face and commanding mien so attracted the interest of the several artists and excited such an unusual desire to try their pencils upon him, that one of them approached the writer as he was leaving the room and whispered, "I will take your friend *for nothing;* I am so struck with his appearance." The choice, however, fell upon one (Eichholtz) who was said to be self-taught, but true to nature. The portrait which he painted was indeed a faultless likeness, and now adorns the parlor of the writer, as the remembrance of the original still warms his heart. One of the peculiarities of the Bishop was occasionally to use a coarse word in a kind and playful way. It was whilst sitting for this portrait that he preached that great sermon of his in St. James' Church, from the text "What shall I do to be saved?" On returning from church, he said to the writer: "Did you see that *rascal* in church to-day?" "What rascal, Bishop?" "Why, that fellow Eichholtz. I know that he came there not so much to worship God as to look at me." This was indeed the truth, for the artist confessed afterward that, through the agency of a friend, he had obtained a seat in the centre of the church, with the view of catching the spirit and expression of the Bishop, to give life to his canvas.

Such was the man to whom a gracious Providence had, in an unlooked-for way, directed the infant Church of North Carolina; and such his manner and appearance as he first stood before a people to whom he was so lately a stranger even in name, with

but a short experience of the pastor's life, and himself a comparatively recent convert to the faith that he was about to preach, and to the Church in which he was to be a ruler. And yet, in less than seven years, what a work did he accomplish! It would be difficult for any one who was not a member of the Diocese at that time to conceive the obstacles which then stood in the way of the Church's progress. As a regular organization the Diocese itself was only in its sixth year, with barely enough clergymen to entitle it to a Bishop. The congregations, few in number, were widely scattered, with no medium of inter-communication better than the common wagon road, and what was still harder to be overcome, so connected were they by marriage and other ties with the different denominations around them, as to be under a species of vassalage which repressed, even where it was most fervently entertained, the true spirit of the Church. Although the clergy were sound in their views of the Church as a heaven-ordained agency distinct from the self-appointed authorities of the sects around, there was but one of them * that fearlessly and habitually set forth her Catholic and Apostolic Character. It was not long, however, before the trumpet voice of their Bishop cheered the faint-hearted, and rallied his people around him firm and united as a Grecian phalanx. A few months after he entered the Diocese a distinguished layman, Speaker of the House of Representatives, said to the writer: "Sir, you have a noble Bishop. He is already making a wide breach in the enemy's walls; you must stand by him."

In dealing with a people but little acquainted with the true character of the Church, his policy was to strike at the more intellectual and influential class of society, and then, with the aid of their example, build up congregations and parishes as opportunity might offer. "*Example descends*," he was frequently heard to say. And such was the effect of his labors in that way that at his death there were very few prominent men in the State that were not either members of our communion, or else its warm friends and advocates. In defence of that policy the writer more than once heard him repeat the story of the Turkish Sultan who, upon being asked by one of his Satraps what he should do in order to

* Rev. Thomas Wright.

put down an insurrection within his Province, as his only reply, took him into the garden, and standing in the midst of a bed of poppies, drew his scymetar and cut off the heads of some of the tallest.

From what has been said it will be seen that Bishop Ravenscroft was indeed a man of marked characteristics. But, though strikingly unlike most men in many particulars, he scorned the affectation of appearing singular. If ever a man was just what he appeared to be, Bishop Ravenscroft was that man. His honesty of character was a positive transparency. He had no concealments, no system of tactics, nothing of what the world calls "policy." Walking with him one day in the streets of Philadelphia, and speaking on this subject, he said to the writer: "There is not a thought in this heart that I would not be willing to publish from Christ's Church steeple." Once at the table of Mr. S——, a distinguished lawyer of that city, where a number of Bishops and clergy were dining, Bishop Ravenscroft made one of his fearless declarations of what he either would do or had done in a case then under discussion. Bishop Hobart, in his usual courtly manner, observed, "But, my dear sir, that would not be good policy." He had scarcely got the words out, when Bishop Ravenscroft, bringing the handles of his knife and fork down with some force upon the table, said, in a tone that made the company start, "Policy! sir, policy! there is no such word between the lids of the Bible." To this the amiable Bishop of New York very quickly responded, "But you know, my good brother, that Saint Paul tells us how he made himself all things to all men." From this slight incident some little insight may be gained into the characteristics of these two great and good men; the one unsparing, fearless, and uncompromising in the cause of truth; the other equally bold in its defence, but more skillful in his warfare, and more desirous to conquer without wounding. It would have been well for Bishop Ravenscroft's comfort, but not for the cause of the Church, if he had known something of the art of those who, on what they call "proper occasions," know how to give truth the "*go by*." He would thereby have avoided that unpleasant controversy into which he was drawn in relation to the Bible Society. Unpleasant to himself, on account of the unfairness of his opponents, but profitable to the Church, because affording him so good

an opportunity of setting forth her true character and defending her claims.

But devoid as Bishop Ravenscroft was of any dishonest concealment of his views, he was equally so of all fearfulness in proclaiming them. Indeed, he seemed truly not to know what fear was. If any one in his presence happened to doubt the *consequences* of any proposed course of action, he would exclaim, in his overpowering way, "Consequences, sir, consequences! what have you or I to do with consequences?" He might well have taken for his motto, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." Several instances of this fearlessness of spirit are treasured up by his friends. The writer of this was told by a brother-in-law of the Bishop that, when at the age of eighteen, he was crossing the ocean to come to this country, the ship in which he was a passenger became so entangled among icebergs that even the Captain himself begain to despair of deliverance, when young Ravenscroft, accompanied by another like spirit, with a hatchet in hand, went out on the bowsprit, and by cutting off the end of it enabled the ship to swing off and thus disengage herself from her perilous situation. Another amusing instance of his personal fearlessness may not be without interest to those who may wish to know the man as he was. He was once preaching not very far from his residence, when two young men whom he knew came stamping into the church with their high-heeled boots, rather desirous of attracting attention, than of avoiding the disturbance of the congregation. Taking their seats in one of those old-fashioned square pews, with high backs, they commenced a regular interchange of loud whispers—loud enough to attract the attention of the congregation as well as the preacher. After bearing it for some time Mr. Ravenscroft stopped in his discourse, and mildly said that he would be glad if there would be less talking in the congregation. This checked for a time the conversation between these two young gentlemen; but dropping their heads below the backs of the pews so as to be out of sight, they soon renewed it with increased vigor. When, at length, he could bear it no longer, in one of his thundering tones, and pointing with his finger, he said: "I will thank those two young men in that pew to keep silence, while the Word of God is being preached." Springing from their seats and snatching up their hats they stamped out of

the church with more clatter than when they came in, whilst the preacher proceeded with as much composure as if that little episode had been a part of his sermon. After getting out of the church a council of war was held by them, and it was resolved that nothing short of the cudgelling of the offender could retrieve their lost honor and avenge so gross an insult. Accordingly they adjourned to a neighboring thicket, where each armed himself with a stout club. It was then agreed that one should stand behind the church, while the other should wait for Mr. Ravenscroft at the door. When he came out in his gown the following passed between them:—

"I wish to speak with you, Mr. Ravenscroft."

"Very well, sir; here I am."

"Will you step behind the church with me?"

"Certainly, sir, certainly."

On arriving where the other stood holding his club with a trembling hand there was an awkward pause, broken at length by Mr. Ravenscroft himself asking, "Well, young gentlemen, what do you want with me?" One of them mustered courage enough to answer, "We wish to know what you meant by so insulting us just now." "What insult?" demanded Mr. Ravenscroft, in one of his startling tones. When they stated that it was his speaking to them in the church, and that they demanded an apology from him, the apology came at the top of his voice, in these words, "Boys, I am ashamed of you; and you ought to be ashamed of yourselves. You are shaming your parents, too, for they have taught you better than this. You Jim B——k are the son of a good old Presbyterian Elder, who would be grieved to know how you have behaved to-day. And as for you, Jack B——, you have had Church training, and ought to know better, sir. What would your mother think of you, if she could see you as you are at this moment? Go home boys, go home." The end of the matter was, in his own peculiar manner of relating it, that they "tucked their tails between their legs and went away."

Another instance of a somewhat similar kind occurred on his visit to Tennessee and Kentucky the year previous to his death. One evening the stage-coach, in which he and several others were passengers, took in a man who was considerably intoxicated, and soon began to be very talkative and very profane. After a little

the Bishop, in a kind manner, told him that his language was unpleasant to his fellow-passengers, and requested him to speak without the addition of any oaths. To this, the man replied that his mouth was his own, and that he would do with it as he pleased. The Bishop made no reply; but when his profane language was renewed in a more offensive form he again kindly reminded the man that, when he came into the coach, the passengers were all on good terms with each other, and each in his turn contributing to the pleasure of the others, whilst *he* was making himself disagreeable to all. To this came another and more insulting reply, with a renewal of his outrageous language. The Bishop then, thinking that longer forbearance was ceasing to be a virtue, clapped his hand with some force on the shoulder of the offender, who was sitting next to him, and in his most terrific tone, said, "Utter another oath, sir, if you dare, and I will drop you under the wheels of the coach." A clap of thunder could not more suddenly or more effectually have silenced the wretched man. Not a word was, for some time, spoken by any one in the coach, and the frightened creature never opened his lips during the remainder of the night. As day began to dawn, the poor fellow, to use the very words of the Bishop, "stole several timid side-glances at him, to see whether it was a human being or a grizzly bear that had so growled at him, and laid so huge a paw upon his shoulder." At sunrise next morning he got out at his home, which was not far from the road-side. But before leaving, he turned towards the coach, and said, "Ladies and Gentlemen, I humbly beg your pardon for my conduct last night;" and, addressing himself to the Bishop, said, "Sir, I particularly ask your pardon, and thank you for stopping me, as you did." He then stated that he was not "a drinking man;" but that he had got with some old friends the day before, and had made a fool of himself. The Bishop, a good deal affected by the man's humble apology, said, "My friend, I freely forgive you, but remember that there is One, up 'there," pointing with his finger, "from whom you must yet receive pardon, and strength also, if you want to be a better man." He then shook his hand, and said, "I hope you may find all well at home."

At another time, on his first visit to Philadelphia, when porters and hack-drivers were allowed to rush into a newly-arrived steamboat like a set of Algerine pirates boarding a cutter, a stout Irish

porter seized the Bishop's trunk and was in the act of lifting it upon his shoulder, when a stentorian voice made him as quickly return it to its place. On a slight movement being made among some persons standing near, the man again began to lift the trunk, when "PUT IT DOWN," in a voice of thunder, made him once more release his hold. A third attempt was made before the Bishop was ready to move, when, in a lower, but equally terrific tone, he said, "Touch that trunk again sir, before I tell you, and I will drop you into the Delaware." This was enough for Pat, who stood fixed by the side of his anticipated prize, looking with a mixture of fear and wonderment on its owner. After a moment or two more, the Bishop said, "Now, my friend, take the trunk and go ahead of me; but take care to keep within six paces of me." As the writer was then walking at the Bishop's side he was amused to see Pat looking back, every few steps, to be sure that he neither exceeded nor fell short of the prescribed distance. This is a rough story to tell of the good Bishop, and does indeed show him in one of his unflattering points. But let the reader remember that the monarch of the forest is often known to roar in his most pacific moods. The truth is, the Bishop "knew his man," and by that very roughness of manner not only accomplished his present purpose, but very probably gained in that stout Irish heart a friend and admirer for life.

While thinking, one day, of his habitual fearlessness and self-command, the writer was tempted to ask, "Bishop, were you ever '*put out*' in your life?" "Yes, twice," was the immediate answer. "Pray tell me how it was." "Once when my light went out, and again when Brother Hawley's pulpit ran away with me." Upon being asked to explain, he said that, on the first occasion, he was holding an evening service and lecturing at the house of a friend in Richmond; a large number had filled several of the rooms; the prayers were through, and he had, for about five minutes, to use his own words, "got on swimmingly with his subject," when all at once a curtain, as it were, fell before his mind. He could remember neither his text nor a word that he had been saying, and had, after a brief apology, to dismiss the congregation, saying, "My friends, my light has gone out." In the second instance, it will be remembered by many of the older church-goers of the city of Washington that the lofty pulpit of the old St. John's Church,

of which good Dr. Hawley was so long rector, was within the chancel-railing, and placed on wheels, in order that it might be removed to one side on Communion occasions.

"When I was preaching there, one Sunday," said the Bishop in a playful manner, "seeing so many 'big folks' before me, I thought that I would be big too, and accordingly I put a little additional powder into my gun. In the middle of my sermon, when all eyes were directed towards me, I unfortunately lifted my hand somewhat higher than usual, which gave the pulpit a start, and away it went, apparently bent on settling in the midst of the foremost pews crowded with ladies. It was a bare moment, however, before its progress was arrested by the rail of the chancel; but during that moment the church presented a singular scene, the women screaming, and the men springing from their seats with hands uplifted to stop the strange thing."

Another incident may here be noted which may serve to illustrate one of his peculiarities, although some may think that it was carried a little too far. A church had been built in the town of M——n by a general subscription. Although the members of the church were the largest contributors, it not long after fell into the possession of the Presbyterians, but was nevertheless open to the occasional use of others. On one of the Bishop's visits to that place, the writer, as usual when traveling with him, read the prayers, the worthy minister of the church sitting in the pulpit at his back. When the "service" was over, the writer came down and motioned to the Bishop to go up and take his place; but was answered by a shake of the head. Another motion was made, supposing that the first was not understood; but was met by another and more determined shake. A whisper in his ear was equally unavailing to move him. He said that he was not willing to preach with another man in the pulpit behind him. The thing ended rather awkwardly in the worthy man's being requested by a common friend to come down in order to make way for the Bishop. When the writer, as they came from the church, said, "Oh, Bishop, how could you act in that way to-day?" His answer, though amusing, was not equally kind and just. "I have no idea, sir, of a man's sitting behind me and making mouths at me while I am preaching the Word of God." I will add that the worthy minister took it all in a good spirit, until some of his people told him that it was a great insult, when he began to get as angry as they were.

And yet, under all this lion's hide there beat a truly kind and loving heart. Well does the writer remember, as though it were but yesterday, almost the last words uttered by that dear man, a day or two before his death, "Brother G., I have been a rough *creatur*"—as he often purposely pronounced that word—"but," he added with deep feeling, and striking his broad breast, "God knows there was no roughness here." He was very fond of little children, although he often addressed them as little "*trouble-worlds;*" and they became equally fond of him, after they got over the fear of his shaggy eyebrows. A kinder or more thoughtful husband never lived. His devotion to his wife during her last illness was constant and untiring, being scarcely one moment from her bedside, and insisting upon performing for her every office that propriety would admit. And when the writer was committing her body to the ground he asked to be permitted to take the concluding portion of the service at the grave. When he came to "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, and dust to dust," his voice was so choked and his whole frame shook so violently that it was feared by many that he would fall into the grave. It was, indeed, a strange and moving spectacle to see tears streaming from those eyes that looked in general as though they could not be forced to weep.

The nature of that thing called *tact* was unknown to Bishop Ravenscroft. His straightforwardness could never be induced to give way to mere expediency. His unbending character was not long in being perceived by his people; but they soon learned that, so far from being obstinately wedded to his own views, he was not only open to the reasoning of others, but would often ask the opinions of some of the youngest of his clergy. It was this straightforward, fearless, and uncompromising character that prompted Chief Justice Henderson, when, at a large dinner party, he was called upon for a "toast," to say, "Gentlemen, I give you BISHOP RAVENSCROFT, the St. Paul of the South, in all things," and then pausing for a moment, added, "*except* in making himself all things to all men."

His want of tact in a measure unfitted him for the task of catechising children or conducting a Bible Class. His mind grasped the larger points of a subject so fully as seemingly to leave no room for those lesser details that are easily comprehended by young minds, and serve as convenient stepping-stones to higher

and larger truths. For instance, the writer of this had once prepared a very intelligent class of girls for examination by the Bishop on the New Testament, and was anticipating the result with no little pride, when the very first question "puzzled" both teacher and scholars. "Young ladies, what is the principal petition in the Lord's Prayer?" The only answer was a blush, a frightened expression of the eyes, and a pleading look at their instructor, who had to confess that he had not taught either himself or his class to set any one petition of that prayer before all the others. The Bishop then said that, in his view, its distinguishing feature was that which related to the forgiveness of injuries.

Bishop Ravenscroft was an impressive and deeply interesting reader. That interest was owing more to his evidently understanding and thoroughly feeling his subject than to any skill in the arts of the Rhetorician. His voice, though apparently incapable of much inflection, never palled upon the ear. Not a syllable was lost; for whether he was in the Pulpit or the Desk, a perfect stillness reigned throughout the congregation. The writer was often surprised to see the apparent attention of children who were of too tender an age to understand either the Prayers or the Sermon.

As a Preacher he was justly entitled to be called *evangelical* in the proper and unabused sense of that term; for any one who will look into his sermons cannot fail to see that the Depravity of man, the Atonement of the Cross, and the need of the renewing power of the Holy Ghost were his favorite topics. His sermons were long, seldom less than forty or fifty minutes; but even then, too short to many of his hearers. His only gesture was a slight elevation of the right hand. Although he very seldom preached an unwritten sermon, he had the art of so reading his manuscript that his eye was, for a mere instant, taken from the congregation. He was often asked to hold an Evening Service in the house of a friend; on which occasions he always spoke without either written sermon or notes, and from the first passage that presented itself. And it was frequently remarked by those who heard those lectures that they were even superior to his Pulpit exercises. Though strictly adhering in public, to the prescribed Forms of the Church, he frequently used extempore Prayer in his own family, and amid his friends; and beyond all other men known to the writer, he possessed what may properly be

called the "gift of prayer": Not a mere redundance of expression, nor expertness in crowding in a multitude of Scripture phrases, but words warm from the heart, and well-befitting the worship of Him to whom they were addressed.

The style of his sermons was plain, as was also their meaning. His straightforwardness was to be seen there as plainly as in his general action. He had no stomach for hair-breadth distinctions; and positively hated what is generally understood as "Metaphysics." His mind was of a character to grasp the strongest points of a subject, leaving all side issues and minor considerations to be dealt with by others. He read but few books, but digested them thoroughly. For the "Fine Arts" he seemed to have but little taste. The Church which he built in Mecklenburg County, on account of its very high pitch and almost square form, was laughingly compared by his friends to a "Tobacco-barn." Both in writing and in conversation he was as fond, as Homer was, of using compound words, such as *Heaven-descended*, *God-ordained*, and *Man-appointed*. There was one word which he frequently used out of its usual meaning,—the word *concerning*, for instance, a "concerning truth," a "concerning thought." And he would even sometimes purposely misspell a word, if it seemed to him to give more force to its meaning:—thus he always wrote "I am *sett* for the defence of the Gospel." Though generally correct in pronouncing his words, he would occasionally take a way of his own; and if reminded as he frequently was, by the writer, that he was going contrary to "Walker's" rules, he would burst out, "Who is Dick Walker? I have as much right to make a Dictionary as he has."

Notice has already been taken of his command over his Congregations. A striking instance of this occurred at a small neighborhood Church in Virginia. He had got, in the Service, as far as the "Creed," and had repeated the first Article, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth," when he perceived that not one mouth in the Congregation responded to those words. Turning his Prayer-Book over on the Desk, and looking over the congregation with a mixture of trouble and surprise, he said, in a voice that startled every one, "Brethren, am I in the midst of a Heathen or a Christian people? Can it be possible that there is no man or woman present, who believes in 'God

ıe Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth?'" Then, after ıusing a moment, as if to let the people recover themselves, he ıid, "Let us try again." On commencing a second time, his ·eat voice was nearly drowned in the mingled responses of every an, woman, and child in the house. After thus frightening this ongregation, he not long after endeared himself to them by a ·tle piece of thoughtfulness which they hardly expected from m. Soon after the commencement of his sermon a very dark oud arose, threatening a speedy and heavy fall of rain. Both en and women, who had all come on horse-back, began to feel ıeasy about their saddles, and to look wistfully out of the ıor; but such was their fear of disturbing that big man in the ılpit, that not one of them ventured to leave his seat. Their ıeasiness, however, was perceived by Mr. Ravenscroft, who kind- said, "My friends, I will pause five minutes in my discourse, in ·der that you may take care of your saddles." The house was on emptied, the saddles thrust under the Church, and, every one seated before the five minutes were out. From that time forth ·r. Ravenscroft was in high favor with that Congregation.

Although deeply engaged in his work whilst preaching, he sel- ›m failed to notice any marked attention or immediate effect pro- ıced on any of the Congregation. When he was preaching that ·eat sermon in St. James' Church, Philadelphia, the Congrega- ›n embraced many of the leading men of the Bar and Bench of ıe City; and the writer, being in the Desk, could plainly see the arked effect of the words of that man of God. The Bishop act- g up to his principle of "striking high," had aimed some of s stoutest shafts at a distinguished lawyer, who sat before m. After coming out of the Church, he said, "Did you notice —y to-day? Why the man was *sitting upon a hackle* through ıe whole sermon." Those who are at all acquainted with flax-mak- g will be amused with the figure thus used to express the un- ısiness of that distinguished man under the smitings of God's 'ord. But before we left the Church an amusing, or rather char- ·teristic scene took place in the vestry-room, between the Bishop ıd the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, Rector of the Church, who yielded › none of the Bishop's own Clergy in love and admiration for the an. The Dr. entered the room with an evidently dejected and ssatisfied look, and addressing the Bishop, said, with tears in his

eyes, "Oh, Bishop, that I could preach as *you* do!" "Why *don't* you, sir?" was the blunt reply. "I *can't*, Bishop." "You *can*, sir. Did I preach anything but the simple Gospel to-day?" "No, Bishop, no, but I cannot preach in that way." The Bishop then took his hand and reminded him that it was not by the might or power of man but by the Spirit of God that the Gospel was to accomplish its ends.

Having already introduced the name of a late distinguished Chief Justice of North Carolina, it may not be out of place to record another incident illustrative of the characters of the two men. Near the close of his life the Bishop resided for a year or two in a small village within a mile of the Judge's residence. Having the highest reverence for the Bishop's character, and an equal admiration for the powers of his intellect, the Judge was rejoiced at the prospect of hearing him frequently, and was accordingly early in his pew at the Bishop's first appointment; but strange to say, was never there afterwards. On being asked the reason, he promptly answered with his usual and only oath. "By blood, sir, *I could'nt stand it.* Why, the man poured the whole of his sermon right down into my pew; and did'nt seem to have a word for any body else." What stronger proof could be given on the one hand, of the convincing power of God's word; and on the other of the force and faithfulness with which that noble Bishop dispensed it.

Bishop Ravenscroft was what the world is pleased to call a "High-Churchman," but was, in no sense, a Partyman. In a letter to the writer, he said:

"Everything serves to convince me more and more of the injurious tendency of all half-way measures. I will therefore, have nothing to do with them. Every circumstance also confirms the propriety of being open and candid in declaring our principles. I see that success follows them; and that loss and dilapidation are the result of a different system. No other course can effectually expose and defeat the sectarian arts of our adversaries. So long as they can have it to say, from the conduct of our people, that the differences are, as they endeavor to represent, unimportant, so long will our exertions be neutralized by our own unjustifiable indifference to their vital consequences."

But whilst thus uncompromising in his views of the nature of the Church, and of the Divine authority of a threefold ministry, he knew how to make allowance for those Brethren who, out of a

istaken kindness to others, lower the claims of the Church to a vel with those of the multitudinous Denominations that surround er. When a late Professor of the Theological Seminary of Alexdria was once the subject of conversation, he broke in, "What —l K—h! If there is a man in the world that lives close to s God, it is R—l K—h; but, sir, he knows no more of the hurch than my horse." The wretched system of Calvin, which nally disordered the intellect of that worthy Professor, was held y Bishop Ravenscroft in perfect abomination. He could scarcely peak of it with patience. And, he had just as little sympathy ith those itinerant Revivalists who were going about, as he used o say, in his rough way "dispensing the Holy Ghost from their reeches' pockets." "You can't," he was more than once, heard o say,—"You can't weld a Christian out, *at one heat.*"

Although he lived when the Church in America was comparavely in its infancy, he was as hopeful and as confident of its fuure growth as if it were then before his eyes; and was as fearless setting forth its Apostolic and authoritative character as if the hole world stood at his back. Hence it comes that "North arolina Churchmanship" has almost grown into a proverb; and at his successor in the Episcopate, when leaving her pure comunion for the corruption of Rome, could carry with him only e weak woman who subsequently returned, not to the bosom of e Church she had deserted, but united herself with one of the ast enlightened sects of the land.

Never was there a man who entertained juster ideas of what a ishop of the Church ought to be, or who more fully acted up to at character. To his Clergy he was a loving father, as well as wise ruler, and took a lively interest in all that concerned them. hat he was even proud of them he evidently showed when one y, standing in front of Trinity Church, New York, conversing ith one of the D. Ds., of that City, he placed one hand on the oulder of the writer, and addressing the Rev. Gentleman, said, ith a snap of the fingers, "I would'nt give my fourteen Boys, r, for your whole Diocese." And this reminds the writer of anher evidence to show how justly he appreciated the character of s holy Office. It was once hinted to him that he was likely to invited to a much larger Diocese. He immediately, and in his rong manner, said, "No, sir; I would loose this right arm sooner

than set the first example of 'Translation' in the American Episcopate." To each of his Clergy he bequeathed some little legacy to assure them that they were remembered by him to the last. And it is not doubted that he continued to pray for them after he felt in his last hour, that prayer was no longer needed by himself. No Bishop was ever more prompt at the call of duty, or spared himself less in its performance. Punctual to a moment, he kept no man, and especially, no Congregation waiting for him. If an appointment was to be met he took no thought of the weather, and to use his own words he would "be on hand" at the appointed hour; and if he found "no congregation there, would ride around the Church, and leave his horse's tracks in the snow, as a testimony against them." There was no duty which he more frequently impressed upon his Clergy than that of faithfully preparing their Candidates for Confirmation. One of his letters now lies before the writer, in which he says, "If Judge R . . . . n thinks of Confirmation he will, when I come, have an opportunity which may not soon recur. Examine faithfully, by giving him the true grounds on which the worth of the Ordinance rests,—hearty repentance, and true faith."

From all that has been stated it may be easily seen that the manner of Bishop Ravenscroft was rather of the commanding than winning order. By a casual observer it might have been pronounced harsh and dictatorial. He was himself aware of his want of the *suaviter in modo.* For he once playfully said to the writer, "Brother G. *you* have too much milk-and-water in your composition, and *I* have too much vinegar. Now, if we could be kneaded together, and rolled out, and divided, what two capital fellows we would make." Though full of such little pleasantry, he never let himself down for a moment from his habitual dignity of deportment; and through a seven years' intimacy the writer never knew him to laugh aloud. He was no great talker in mixed companies, because he had no taste for those inferior subjects which make up the staple of general conversation. He often produced a smile by his strong and homely comparisons, some of which have already been noted. To a lady who was thinking of removing from his Parish, in Virginia, to a place where there were no Church privileges, and no Christian communion, he said, "Sister G—e, I tell you, what, *A chunk, by itself, will go out.*" To a

brother Clergyman of Virginia, who told him that his Vestry would not let him use a Surplice, he said "If they were my Vestry, sir, they should either *pull or balk.*" To a friend who was borrowing from him a horse that trotted very hard, he said, "You are welcome to him, sir, but there will be plenty of day-light between you and the saddle."

While penning these lines, the following incident was related to the writer as a true story; and it certainly fits in with what has been shown of the Bishop's unceremonious and summary way of treating a subject.

On one of his journeyings he encountered a worthy old Baptist Preacher who had long desired to see him and to break a lance with him on his favorite subject of *immersion.* As soon as they were introduced to each other the old gentleman challenged the Bishop to a regular discussion as to the proper *mode* and proper *subjects* for Christian Baptism. He readily consented, but said, "There is one preliminary question which I would like to have settled before we begin;—that is, '*Where, sir, do you get your authority to baptize any body, or in any way?*'" This was an unexpected thrust for which the good man was entirely unprepared, and put an end at once to the hope which he had so confidently entertained of an easy victory.

In his religious character Bishop Ravenscroft was an example to all who knew him. He was emphatically a "man of prayer." It was the good fortune of the writer to accompany him in many of his visitations, and oftentimes to occupy the same room with him. He had thus an opportunity of witnessing his morning and evening devotions, at his bedside, when a more retired place could not be obtained for the purpose. On one occasion finding a small adjoining room unoccupied he shut himself in, with the hope of being out of the hearing as well as of the sight of every one. The writer happening to go into the room which he had just left, was startled and alarmed at hearing deep and repeated groanings proceeding from that little chamber. Recognizing the well-known voice of his beloved Bishop, and supposing him to be taken with a sudden and painful illness, he was about flying to his relief, when he was arrested by distinguishing words of earnest prayer. It was that man of God, not in bodily suffering, but mourning for the thousandth time over his past offences, and wrestling, in all the fervency of his

strong nature, to obtain renewed pardon, and more and more grace and strength to meet the demands of his high and holy calling. He was a constant reader of the Bible, and that without note or comment. Indeed he seemed to set but little value on any Commentator; for, to use his own expression, "Whenever he consulted them in any difficulty, he found that they were just as deep in the mud, as he was in the mire."

To the poor he was a liberal giver; and so little did he care to accumulate or even to save, that after commencing life with a large fortune he may be said to have died insolvent, inasmuch as the little that was left was scarcely enough to cover a security debt thrown upon him by an undeserving friend. His style of living was plain and simple, and his house the abode of hospitality, and a second home to his Clergy. But whoever sat at his table of a Sunday had to be content with a cold meal, for he allowed no cooking in his house on that day; not only from obedience to the commandment, but as he said, to allow his servants equal spiritual privilege with himself. His dislike to all unnecessary expense and display was strikingly shown in his directions about his funeral. Some time before his death he inquired of a carpenter what would be his price for a plain pine coffin, stained black? Upon being answered "Three dollars," he then ordered that just such a coffin, and none other should be prepared for him. He would not even sanction the show and expense of a hearse. In his will he wrote: "Let the body of my sulky be taken off, and my coffin placed upon the shafts. Let my little horse 'Pleasant' carry me to the grave, led by my faithful servant 'Johnson.' Let four verses of the 16th Psalm of David be sung at my burial; but not a word be added to the Service which the Church has appointed for such occasions; for that is too good for me."

His last sermon was preached while sitting in the Chancel of Christ's Church, Raleigh, from these words, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure; they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture Thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail." *Ps.* cii.. 25, 26, 27 verses.

From this time he declined rapidly. The writer, though living

fifty miles distant, was frequently at his bedside; and though grieved at the thought of soon losing so loving a friend and father, was comforted at seeing that Death had for him no terror, and the grave was looked to only as a resting place. When the writer was about to leave him, two days before his death, he took his hand and said, "My dear father, you have served God faithfully, and I feel sure therefore, that nothing is allowed to obscure your view of the inheritance provided for you." His answer was, "Not a cloud, sir, not a cloud."

The writer will here, in conclusion, introduce one more incident in connection with the Bishop's last illness. His disease was of a nature to unstring his whole nervous system, and produce an impatience and irritability utterly unknown to him when in health. He would become strangely excited from the slightest cause; but the feeling would pass away as quickly as it came, followed by an acknowledgment of his weakness and an humble request to be forgiven. It should here be mentioned that previous to his last sickness, he had promised to leave a portion of his sermons to be published for the benefit of the Diocesan Missionary Society. He had also in his will directed his Executor to burn every manuscript of whatsoever kind that was not marked for publication. Whilst in this unnerved state, and fast approaching his end it was greatly feared that he had forgotten to mark those sermons, or else that he had not sufficient strength to do it. Here was indeed a painful quandary; for unless this was done, his Executor, then present, declared that he would literally comply with the Bishop's will by destroying, the day after his death, every scrip of his pen, including of course, all his sermons.

In order to save this treasure to the Diocese and to the Church at large, the writer was requested to approach the dying Bishop on that subject. It was a truly painful undertaking to him, knowing as he did his extreme irritability as well as great bodily weakness; but the occasion demanded it.

Though the greatest caution was used in broaching the subject, the effect upon the poor Bishop was truly distressing. For a few moments his nervous excitement seemed as if it would extinguish the last lingering spark of life. The scene was as painful then, as it is indescribable now; for the writer really feared that he had given the death-blow to his beloved friend and father in

God. It was not long however, before this strange paroxysm began to subside. Then followed a scene of a different character. When the heaving of his breast was settling down, like the swell of the ocean after a storm, in a voice scarcely audible he said, to the writer who stood weeping at some distance from the bed. "My son, come here, come here; come closer; Oh forgive your old father; forgive him; he is not himself; he is nothing but a child; you know that he loves you, and would not willfully give you the slightest pain." He then said, "Kneel down; put your head lower; lower still." When it at last rested on the bedside his uplifted hands fell upon it, and pressing with all his little remaining strength, he poured forth, upon that head a stream of blessing, far exceeding that which good old Jacob showered upon all his sons. At this moment those hands still seem to press the writer's head; and whatever favor, either from God or man may since have come upon him he willingly ascribes in good part, to the benedictions of that dying hour.

He was subsequently informed that in a short time after he had left the room the Bishop said to his servant, "Johnson, Prop me up in my bed; give me my pencil; bring me that box; knock off the lid, and hand me my sermons one by one." He then, in that weak and almost unconscious state, glanced merely at the subject or text of each, and put a cross mark on such as he was willing to leave behind him.

This rather tedious narration may appear needless to many, but it is not without its bearing on the reputation of Bishop Ravenscroft. For among the sermons thus marked by his dying hand, and contained in the first edition of his works were discovered by the Publisher two discourses, with some slight alterations, by a distinguished Divine of England. How they came to be thus found among the Bishop's own sermons may be accounted for in the following manner.

While a Candidate for Orders he acted as Lay-Reader for the benefit of his neighbors. Finding that they were strongly prejudiced against sermons read out of a printed volume, but were willing to tolerate them in the manuscript form, with the view of removing that objection, he copied, with his own hand, a few of the same sermons, making such alterations and omissions as would better adapt them to the capacity and circumstances of the con-

gregation. These sermons, being in the same hand-writing with the others, labeled in like manner, and unintentionally thrown into the same box might, very naturally and excusably, be mistaken for his own, when, as we have just seen, under extreme prostration both of mind and body, he undertook, by a mere glance at their texts or titles, to make the intended selection.

With this statement, unnecessary as it may appear to those who knew him, the writer closes this tribute of affection, written less with ink than out of the wellings of a fond heart, and extended far beyond what was first designed. The interest of his subject has led him on insensibly from one pleasant reminiscence to another. His once idolized Diocesan has seemingly stood before him in that mingling of grandeur and lovableness which were ever contending for mastery in his true character. May he, from the Paradise of the blessed, forgive his son, if he has said anything of him but the truth. While making this feeble offering to his memory the writer can truly say, after the manner of Bishop Horne, that the hours flew swiftly by; he was loth to obey the calls to both rest and food; his subject grew upon him with an absorbing and almost painful interest to the very last; and he only sorrowed, when he found that his work was done.

Art. V.—THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

In our former articles * we endeavored to show that the conclusions best warranted by facts and reasoning, were these—

That the visit to Crete and Epistle to Titus are to be placed within the three years' residence of St. Paul at Ephesus. That the First Epistle to Timothy was written from Cæsarea during the imprisonment there of two years. That there is no historical incompatibility in any passage of Scripture with these views, nor improbability from any development of Church polity or institutions, and that the other objections possess little weight.

We have before adverted to the theory of two imprisonments with an interval between them of four or five years, devoted to apostolic visitations and labors. It is this theory we proceed to

* July and October.

discuss. The position which the Second Epistle to Timothy occupies, can be best settled after such examination.

It is in the first place material to trace the progress of St. Paul from Cæsarea to Rome, where, all agree, an imprisonment took place.

After the appeal some time elapsed before the voyage to Italy began. The day after sailing they touched at Sidon. Passing under Cyprus * they came to Myra, a city of Lycia. The centurion found there a ship of Alexandria bound to Italy. They then sailed under Crete to Fair Havens on the southern side of Crete. At last they reached Melita (Malta) where they spent three months. Landing at Puteoli, they journeyed to Rome, when the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard, where Paul was suffered for some time to dwell by himself, with a soldier to guard him.

Then follows, "and Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

Thus the narrative in the Acts terminates. Other passages of Scripture connected with the subject are noticed in the ensuing discussion.

We submit the following propositions:

1. When St. Luke wrote the last passage in Acts, the imprisonment, which had then lasted two years still continued, and was of the same light character.

It appears to be satisfactorily made out that St. Luke wrote the Acts, and sent it to Theophilus from Rome, at the close of the two years mentioned. It is urged by some critics that the first and natural construction is, that the past fact of residence was followed by something else, "and then" for example, being premised; yet it is scarcely credible that if such residence had been closed, either by death, natural or violent, or by a release, it would not have been mentioned. The idea of Shrader that St. Luke was deterred from mentioning the death by fear of Nero is visionary. It could at least have been stated that he had died. (See Olshausen apud Clark's Foreign Theology Library, Vol. 13, p. 221, and Davidson's Intro. Vol. 2, p. 528). Dr. Davidson states and answers the

* Along the Northern shore.

arguments of writers who affirm that the passage was written after the two years of captivity. He concludes that it was written during such captivity.

St. Luke was with the Apostle when the Epistle to Philemon (v. 24) that to the Colossians, (10, 14) and when Second Timothy were written (10 v. 11). St. Paul was then in bonds.

2. St. Paul had not been arraigned during those two years at Rome before any tribunal or judge. No answer or defence had of course been made. St. Luke's omission of such a fact is a very strong proof that nothing of the kind had taken place. He was suffered to dwell by himself, with a soldier at first; then he was in his own hired house, teaching and exhorting, no one forbidding him.

Mr. Burton * is the only writer, that I am aware of, who supports the theory of such an arraignment and defence. He refers to the seventh verse of the first chapter of Philippians. "Inasmuch as both in bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel, ye are all partakers of my grace."

The word apology (defence) used in this passage is the word used in Second Timothy iv. 16, "in my first defence," but Dr. Ellicott says it must be connected with the word translated *confirmation.*

Olshausen supposes that it refers to the judicial process which led to the imprisonment, that, as I understand him, at Jerusalem.

But what is the meaning the words best bear? The grace St. Paul speaks of was the grace of suffering in support of the Gospel, and of this grace, or of any grace, possessed by himself, they, the Philippians were partakers. Ye share with me the grace which I have had in my bonds, and in any vindication and confirmation of the Gospel. The other version, "partakers with me of grace" will not vary this result. The supposition of Dr. Burton has a very slight foundation.

3. During the two years at Rome, the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, the Colossians, and that to Philemon were written. Timothy came to Rome during this period, uniting in three of such Epistles. St. Luke was also there, when three of such epistles

---

* First three centuries, Vol. 1, p. 264

were written. The Second Epistle to Timothy stating "that no one stood by me, but all forsook me" does not imply a departure from Rome, but only the absence and want of the countenance of friends at the trial. It does not disprove the fact of St. Luke being at Rome during the trial. Dr. Ellicott renders it "stood forward with me" referring to the advocate supporting the accused, and to the practice of Christians encouraging their brethren in prison. The phrase "deserted or forsook me" implies no more than such neglect "to support him," (*Pastoral Epistles* 178.

4. The Epistle to the Hebrews, if rightly attributed to St. Paul, was written when Timothy was absent, whether imprisoned or not. Even if he rejoined the Apostle, they were soon separated, and this separation continued when Second Timothy was written. The the better opinion is, that Hebrews was written from Rome during the two years confinement.

The views of the most learned and able of the late writers as to this Epistle, appear to leave the authorship between St. Paul and Apollos. Dr. Davidson has a very able argument for its authenticity as a genuine Pauline Epistle, written from Rome. The testimony of the Alexandrian Church is very marked. Clement about the year 200, Dyonysius, Theognostus, Alexander and Athanasius 320, and Euthatius 460, concur in the same view. (Westcott Canon New Testament 396–414). The tardy acceptance of it into the canon of the Latin Church cannot, as a question of evidence, be placed upon an equal footing with its acceptance in the Eastern.

Dr. Davidson has a difficulty arising out of the text—"they which are of Italy salute you," in reconciling it with the idea of the Epistle being written at Rome. He notices that several manuscripts have the subscription "from Rome," instead of "from Italy." These subscriptions, it is admitted, are unreliable. But the passage is in the text (v. 24). Allow it full force, yet we suggest that converts from other parts of Italy would gather at Rome to hear the Apostle. There would be Romans among them, although not all Romans. So the meaning may be. The Christians of Italy now with me at Rome, salute you.

But from Lange's Commentary (on Hebrews, p. 13 and p. 214) we find that several learned critics consider the phrase to indicate, that the Epistle was written outside of Italy to Jewish Christians

at Rome. He himself leaves the point undecided. The opinion of the ancients is allowed to have been in favor of its composition at Rome.

5. Timothy, as before stated, joined the Apostle at Rome at some time during the two year's imprisonment. He was absent, perhaps had been imprisoned, when Hebrews was written. * He was absent, and generally supposed to have been at Ephesus, when Second Timothy was written.

6. St. Paul had reasonable grounds during these two years for supposing that he would be liberated. Hence he expresses the hope and even strong expectation of re-visiting the scenes of his former ministrations, but all this hope and confidence is mingled with doubt or despondency.

The success of the Apostle before Agrippa, the lightness of his confinement at Rome, the character of the accusations involving only questions of worship to which the Emperor was then indifferent, justified the expectation of a deliverance. Yet uncertainty and forboding were blended with the hope. We cannot say whether the shadow or the light most prevailed.

The following passages sustain these views. "I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles. . . . I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you. . . . But that ye may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister shall make known to you all things." (Ephesians *passim.*)

"To abide in the flesh is more needful for you, and having this confidence, I know that I shall abide, and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy in the faith. . . . Yet if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all. All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household. I trust in the Lord to send Timotheus unto you shortly. Him I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly." (Philippians *passim.*) "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty (*hath been sent abroad*) with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." (Hebrews xiii.

* Know ye that our brother Timothy is set as liberty, with whom, if he come shortly, I will (shall) see you. (Lange's Hebrews, p. 218.)

23). Pray for us, I beseech you, the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner. (Ibid. xviii. 19.)

"But withal prepare me also a lodging, for I trust that through your prayers, I shall be given unto you. (Philemon v. 22).

When these passages are brought together they seem to indicate, sometimes the utmost confidence of obtaining freedom, and sometimes the deep presentiment of a certain death. He directs the preparation of a lodging at Colosse, yet if he became a sacrifice for the furtherance of the Philippians in faith, it will be with joy. And the temperament of St. Paul—the union of sanguine hope and deep despondency, gives intensity to his language.

We are warranted in saying that these passages are consistent with the fact of one imprisonment lasting until his execution.

7. After the close of the two years there was an arraignment. It was met by a successful answer and defence. This was through the strength given by the Lord, when the danger was so great that all deserted him. This direct communication of support from heaven was for some important object in the advancing the cause of the gospel.

But it is almost a certainty that there was no liberation in any sense, either a respite or absolute freedom, until such arraignment and successful defence. If by being "delivered out of the mouth of the lion," * is meant an absolute freedom, it was the consequence of this defence.

No substantial reason can be given why St. Paul should have been brought to trial, and at such imminent peril of life, between the autumn of 63 the close of the two years, and July 64. † But if, when the persecution began, he was in his modified confinement, then would concur, the hatred of the Jews, the pretence that Christians were state enemies declaring that there was another King, and the fury of the populace, to lead to his immediate slaughter, or closer custody. That he was somewhat a prisoner and guarded, would save him from assassination; and influences in Cæsar's household may have obtained for him a trial.

Assuming (as we think is reasonably proven,) that there was no trial until after the expiration of the two years and more, we have

* 2 Timothy iv. 17.

† Dr. Davidson's View. The fire at Rome was of this date.

next the fact of a trial and successful defence. The passages in Second Timothy are almost our only Scriptural guide, as the far better conclusion is, that the other Epistles from Rome were written during the two years.

"At my first answer no man stood with me, but all forsook me. Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that the Gentiles might hear; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion."

"And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom."

"I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is near. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."

"Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me. Do thy diligence to come before winter."

"The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments."

"Demas has forsaken me, and departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens unto Galatia; and Titus unto Dalmatia; only Luke is with me."

We have in the first place proof of a trial, involving imminent peril; and a defence successful in averting that peril. It was deliverance from the lion's mouth, and we cannot but consider that this means deliverance from being cast to wild beasts. This is the theory of Benson, Michaelis, and Dr. Hales, though strongly opposed by Ellicott. *

In the next place, the Apostle considers his fate as inevitable; his course as finished. Yet he did not think his death would be immediate. He requests Timothy to come to him, and before the winter, and bring the cloak and parchments with him.

Two points are made prominent; a deliverance from instant peril, and an assurance that his labors were soon to terminate with his life. There are no details of any intervening labors, journeys, or events. There are no hopes uttered of freedom to depart. What he does say is consistent with a slight relaxation of his captivity, and a very limited exercise of his ministry. Indeed, the advocates of the Interval period are decided upon the point that

* Pastoral Epistles, p. 179 *n.*

there was no absolute liberation between the defence stated in Second Timothy and the Martyrdom..

The deliverance, then, produced by the heaven-derived strength of his defence, was only a respite and escape from immediate condemnation. He was made so far free as to be able to declare and preach the Gospel; entirely to fulfil his ministry to the Gentiles, in some respect unperformed. During this respite the Second Epistle to Timothy was written, perhaps as part of that unaccomplished task. Then at some subsequent time the Martyrdom occurred, and they who fix its date as late in the year 64 or in 65, appear to have the great weight of evidence in their favor. The text does not exact more than a limited preaching, if any, as to places or periods. The phrase, "that all the Gentiles might hear" is plainly figurative. I believe all commentators concur in this. This phrase and the one that "by me the preaching might be fully known" are treated as the public avowal and defence of the Gospel in the Roman Capital, at the highest earthly tribunal; perhaps in the forum." *

Mr. Burton, who advocates a full release, and a return to Rome about the year 67, speaks of the Apostle being called upon to make a public defence, and for that time he was spared; but he was only reserved for a protracted imprisonment, and his doom was probably determined some short time after he wrote to Timothy. †

Dr. Davidson, the supporter of the theory of one imprisonment only, admits that there was such a relaxation of severity after the defence, as to allow of a preaching at Rome. He was reserved to make known the truth further at Rome, the center and metropolis of heathenism.

Thus, adhering rigidly to Scripture, supplying the date of the fire at Rome, we submit that a consistent and rational statement is substantially this: The confinement of St. Paul at Rome as a prisoner remained in its laxity after the closing passage of the Acts was written; after the two whole years had expired; after the summer of A. D. 63.

It is the most reasonable supposition that, after the fire of July,

---

* Barnes' Int. to the 2 Epis le § 1, Pastoral Letters, p. 178, citing Weisler. Connybeare, and Howson support the same view.

† Burton's Three Centuries, Vol. 1, p. 313-314.

64, the trial took place, and by the interposition of heaven, his life was spared.

That a period of respite was allowed, during which he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy; and as he begs him to come before the winter it was probably written in the autumn of 64; and the trial and temporary deliverance took place, of course, before this was written, and after July, 64.

And that, as no text or word of Scripture narrates an act or word of the Apostle afterwards, and this Epistle is filled with the consciousness of his approaching doom; we must conclude that all his labors were then ended, and death gave him the crown laid up for him. The year 65, at the latest, closed his course, and gave to Christ the persecutor he had changed to an Apostle, on the road to Damascus.

But this investigation would be incomplete and unsatisfactory if the arguments of the advocates of the Interval theory were not examined.

I have before stated in the language of Dr. Paley and of Conybeare and Howson, what this theory is. It assumes a full liberation in 63, a return to Rome in 67 or 68, and an execution then; and the interval is filled with apostolic labors. A visit to most of the scenes of his former ministrations is supposed, a long sojourn in Spain, and by some, the planting of the Gospel in Britain and Gaul.

All this large hypothesis has not one word of explicit statement in Scripture to support it; has the better argument that there never was any absolute liberation, to repel it; and is placed upon inferences very insufficient to sustain it.

The following passages are cited:

That to the Philippians: "I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly" (ii. v. 24). "I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith." (*Ibid.* i. 25, 26.) "But withal, prepare me a lodging, for I trust that through your prayers I shall also be given unto you" (Philemon). This was written to Philemon at Colosse, in Phrygia, Asia Minor.

He expresses to the Hebrews the desire that they would pray for him, that he might be restored to them the sooner; that

Timothy was set at liberty (sent abroad), with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you" (xiii. 19–23).

I have before noticed these passages. They indicate a strong assurance of his being freed, an assurance justified by the favorable treatment then received. They prove his intention to visit the places named upon such release. They prove no more. Some weight is justly attributed to them, but they are plainly insufficient of themselves to support the theory. The passage from Philippians is referred to as spoken prophetically, and indicating the certainty of the event. But if this is so, the same force should be given to the passage in Acts (xx. v. 25), "I know that ye shall see my face no more." Yet Dr. McKnight and others contend that this was only the strong expression of a desponding mood. He did see the Ephesians again, as they assert. But why should not the language in Philippians be equally the strong expression of a hopeful mood, as that in Acts, of a desponding one?

The passages chiefly relied upon are found in the Second Epistle to Timothy, written, as these advocates consider, about 66 or 68. The Apostle requests Timothy to come to him before winter, and to bring with him his cloak, books and especially the parchments left at Troas with Carpus.

Now St. Paul was at Troas on his return to Asia Minor, before the meeting at Miletus. We may well suppose that the articles were left at Troas on this occasion. It is to be remembered that he went by land, on foot, from Troas to Assos, where they took him in.

The argument used is this: It is incredible, assuming that the things were then left, that St. Paul should not have sent for them before. He allowed them to remain for a period which these writers compute at over six years. Hence, there must have been a visit to Troas much later.

It may be answered,—When they were left at Troas, St. Paul was on his rapid journey to Jerusalem. There was no delay, except of seven days at Tyre, caused by the unloading of the ship. Then followed the uprising of the people on account of his bringing Greeks into the Temple, with Trophimus the Ephesian. Then ensued his long imprisonment at Cæsarea. During that time, however, he had a well-founded expectation of a speedy release. This is clear from the close of the 24th chapter of Acts. He

had made a deep impression upon Felix, who had sent for him often. Money would have procured a liberation. Had he not appealed unto Cæsar before Festus, he would have been discharged by Agrippa. We may conclude that he would have gone to Ephesus upon his release, and perhaps to Troas.

Again, it seems certain that the first intention of those who carried St. Paul from Cæsarea to Rome was to sail into the Ægean Sea, across it to Greece, and so to Italy. The ship they first embarked in was of Adramyttium, a city only a short distance from Troas. Assos was on the gulf of Adramyttium. They did sail in that vessel to Myra, in Lycia, going under Cyprus (east of the island) on account of the winds. Myra was in their course for the Ægean, and is but a short distance from the opening of that sea. Here the Centurion found a vessel sailing for Italy, and embarked in it. Then began the disastrous voyage through the Mediterranean.

There is nothing to warrant the conclusion of some writers, that it was the original plan to find a ship to cross the Mediterranean. On the contrary, it seems the Centurion availed himself of finding a vessel so bound, to save himself much trouble in a journey chiefly by land.

Thus, St. Paul may have expected to obtain the articles during this voyage, and was disappointed by the change of plan.

As to the omission to send for them during the residence at Rome, the reasoning of the advocates of the Interval period may be adopted. St. Paul had a strong conviction of being released, and revisiting some at least of the scenes of his former ministries. Macedonia would be among them, and to go to Philippi he would visit Troas. If this explains his omission to send for them during the two years at Rome, it is amply sufficient to account for the omission during the residence at Cæsarea.

It appears that the articles were of little importance to him, except the parchments. The value of the latter would have made him unwilling to trust any common messenger with them. When all hope of personally reclaiming them was over, and he looked for Timothy to come to him, he would naturally desire that the latter should bring them. Timothy would as probably go by the way of Troas to Rome as by any other route.

One interpretation is that the word rendered "cloak" * is more accurately translated "portmanteau." † If so, it would contain probably the books and parchments. It would be landed, as St. Paul remained seven days in Troas. It was not put on board when the ship sailed for Assos. As St. Paul went on foot from Troas to the latter place, it was not convenient to carry it with him. This view is almost as applicable to the thick riding cloak. He left Greece in the spring.

But the question is not can we give an absolutely sufficient explanation of the delay in getting the things left at Troas? The question is, must we necessarily deduce an unnoticed visit to the last place after the sojourn at Rome, from such delay? Is there no other explanation of it possessing reasonable plausibility? Surely there is.

The statement "Erastus abode at Corinth" is next relied upon.

An Erastus was Chamberlain at Corinth when the Epistle to the Romans was written. He joins in the salutation. An Erastus is also mentioned as having been sent from Ephesus to Macedonia with Timothy (Acts xix. 21). Whether the Chamberlain was the same person as the missionary is disputed. ‡

It is urged that St. Paul could not have meant that Erastus remained there during the whole period of over six years. Timothy well knew of his first residence there. The apostle must be speaking of a later period, when he had revisited the East, and returned to Rome.

But if Erastus the Chamberlain was the missionary, there is no reason for supposing that he abode without intermission at Corinth. We see many of the ministers under St. Paul sent to different places at various times. All that is said is, that at the time of writing, or rather at the time of his latest information, Erastus resided at Corinth. Between the time we first find him there and this period, there may have been numerous changes.

But as the Epistle to the Romans was written after Erastus went with Timothy into Macedonia, and he was no doubt ordained, I think it very improbable that he could have been the Chamberlain of Corinth. If there was another, the one sent to Macedonia, and

* *Pænulam*, a thick riding coat. *Forcellini* Dict.

† Lange's Second Timothy, 116 u.

‡ Ellicott Pastoral Ep., p. 181.

the same referred to in Second Timothy, his intermediate abode or scene of labor is untraced, and the statement gives not the slightest support to the great hypothesis it is called to aid.

The only real difficulty rests in the passage, "But Trophimus have I left at Miletus sick."

It is urged that Timothy was with the Apostle at Rome long enough to unite in several Epistles. If there were two imprisonments, this union must have been during the first. If St. Paul refers to his having left Trophimus at Miletus, when he met the elders, Timothy must have known it at the very time. If it was when he went from Cæsarea to Rome, (and it is to be noticed that he was as near Miletus as the Island of Cnidus), it is incredible that Timothy, (assumed to have been at Ephesus), should not have known it. It is further incredible that during the residence at Rome, he should not have been apprised of the fact. And if it had occurred at Miletus in Crete, the last difficulty is equally great.

Dr. Ellicott adverts to an interpretation by Winer, that the phrase is "they left," meaning "his comrades," and treats it as groundless.

He observes also, that the Miletus, in Crete, is on the north coast, and St. Paul never went near this. He says, "Still more hopeless is the attempt to change the reading with the Arab version, to *Melita* off the Island of Sicily," (Malta).

We find, then, that there is a version, fixing that island as the place where Trophimus was left.

It has also been contended by Bryant and others, that the shipwreck took place at Milete in the Adriatic. Trophimus may have been left there.

The improbability of Timothy's not knowing of this sickness, if Miletus near Ephesus was meant—the almost certainty of his knowing it—and the improbability of the Apostle's not telling him of it at Rome, are circumstances of very great weight. These improbabilities are diminished upon the supposition, either that Melita (Malta) or Milete in the Adriatic was the place.

Baronius, Beza, Grotius and others consider that Melita (Malta) is referred to; a mistake occurring in the Manuscripts. Dr. Davidson rejects this idea, merely on the ground that conjectural emendations should not be allowed.

It is clear that Trophimus was not left sick at Miletus, when the elders were summoned there by St. Paul. He was with him at Jerusalem on the eve of the arrest of the Apostle. He was denounced as an Ephesian brought into the Temple. *

Dr. Davidson, in his very sifting argument thinks that on the voyage from Cæsarea to Rome, Trophimus was left sick at Myra, with the intention that he should be sent to Miletus, and when the passage was written, St. Paul believed that he was there. Yet this truly sensible writer supposes that he demands less of conjecture in this, than in imagining a mistake in the writing of one name for another, closely resembling it. A due consideration of all we can find will make us conclude that much the best view is, that Malta was the place where Trophimus was left, on the voyage to Rome.

It is undeniable that this does not remove all difficulty. Why should it be necessary or useful to apprise Timothy of this fact, when during a residence with the Apostle at Rome, it is scarcely conceivable that he was not informed of it?

We answer, can this obscurity which we cannot dissipate—this difficulty which we cannot solve, be comparable to the excessive difficulty of the theory it is adduced to sustain? Is all made clear upon that theory, and the existence of the fact incompatible with any other? Let us reflect upon what it is asserted to prove. St. Paul was liberated from Rome; he went once more over the regions of the East. He was, years after his first visit, at Miletus again, the Miletus of Caria. † He left Trophimus sick there. He returned to Rome. He writes to Timothy telling him of this fact, and writes this to him, when Timothy was at Ephesus, or at least far nearer to Miletus than the Apostle was at Rome. ‡ The solution brings as thick a darkness as that which envelops the difficulty.

It is said (Lange's Introduction) there must have been two imprisonments, because Mark is spoken of in Colossians (iv. 10) as being with St. Paul, and in Second Timothy as being near Timothy, who is requested to bring Mark with him. And so as to Timothy himself, who undoubtedly was there during the first imprisonment, and is now addressed as absent.

---

* Acts xxi. v. 29.

† Lange 2 Timothy 118 N. ‡ The distance from Ephesus to Miletus is hardly thirty miles. Conybeare and Howson, N. 214. Lange says Timothy was at Ephesus when *this Epistle* was written to him.

But on what possible ground must we conclude that either St. Mark or Timothy, clearly with St. Paul during an imprisonment, remained for the whole of its duration with him? We have indisputably two years of imprisonment, and visits may have been made for a short period. And as we have seen, it is shown by the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Timothy was then absent, and he had undoubtedly been present before, uniting in some Epistles.

The historical notices and traditions must be allowed their due weight. They are stated by Conybeare and Howson, and commented upon elaborately by Dr. Davidson. The passage from Eusebius is capable of the construction, that the preaching of St. Paul was limited to Rome. I have examined the translation of Dr. Harmer and of Professor Creuse, 1836. "It is said he was sent upon the ministry of preaching;" or, "he is said to have been sent upon this ministry of preaching." "It is currently reported that the Apostle again went forth to proclaim the Gospel, and afterwards came to Rome a second time, and was martyred under Nero." The passage from Clemens Romanus, written in the second century, and written from Rome to Corinth, is, "St. Paul had preached the Gospel in the East and in the West; that he had instructed the whole world in righteousness; that he had gone to the extremity of the West before his martyrdom."

Spain, it is urged, was known and often spoken of at the extremity of the West.

But Dr. Davidson * quotes the Greek and translates the passage thus: "Through bigotry, Paul also obtained the reward of patience, after wearing bonds seven times, after being scourged, after being stoned. Having preached the Gospel both in the East and West, he received the reward due to his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having come to the boundary of the West, and having borne his testimony before the rulers. Thus he departed out of the world." Mr. Tate, one of the advocates of two imprisonments, and long journeys in the interim, excludes Spain from the places visited, and comments upon the above passage of Clemens. He urges that the latter was writing from Rome to the Corinthians at the Eastward. Rome formed their idea of the further West. Spain could hardly be known to them. He

* Vol. II., p. 98.

connects the testimony borne before rulers with the boundary of the West, and his departure from the world; all a continuous reference to one locality, and that necessarily Rome.

Now with this sensible criticism, examine every word of the passage from Clemens, and it is as strictly applicable to the one imprisonment, temporary respite, and death in 64–65, as to a second imprisonment and the protracted interval.

Again, if Eusebius understood Clemens to have referred to Spain as the limit of the West, he never would have spoken of the journey there *as reported.* The authority of Clemens would have been decisive.

St. Chrysostom says, St. Paul, after his residence in Rome, departed to Spain. (Conybeare and Howson.) Paul was dismissed by Nero, that he might preach Christ's Gospel in parts of the West. (St. Jerome, quoted by Conybeare and Howson.)

The passage from the canon of Muratori, also quoted by Conybeare and Howson, is critically analyzed by Davidson, and the very little weight due to it fully shown.

To the Euthalian Edition of Acts is prefixed an Itinerary of the Apostle Paul, in which there is nothing of a second imprisonment. Primasius, a disciple of Augustine, says, in his commentary on Romans, that he had promised indeed to go into Spain, but, in the dispensation of God, did not go.*

We cannot but be struck with two facts upon these authorities. First, the limit is a journey to Spain—to no other place—and no time of the duration of the visit is assigned. Next, upon dates conceded by nearly all, there would be, from the close of the narrative in Acts, to the time of the fire and persecution, over a year. It is much less improbable that he was permitted to visit Spain during this period, than a release for five years and the journey to Spain and re-visiting most of his former scenes of labor.

But the evidence of history and tradition is singularly weak and insufficient. If the authority of Clemens is out of the way, the tradition is faint of any journey from Rome, and that dim tradition refers only to Spain.

On the other side are some facts of overruling weight. St. Luke was probably with the Apostle when the record of Acts closes.

---

* Davidson II., 105.

St. Luke was certainly with him when Second Timothy was written, during his imprisonment. There was an interval upon the theory of five years, filled with labors and visits to former scenes and to new fields of labor. Where was St. Luke during that long time, that he has not placed upon record a word as to all these great facts in Apostolic history? He peculiarly undertakes the details of events. And I believe there is not even a tradition of his filling this great void with a word of narrative.

Again, the great mass of the Advocates of the Interval theory agree that First Timothy and Titus were written during this period, at some places he visited.* Yet there is not a word in either referring to a past imprisonment, and so signal a release, or to any labors as subsequent. The statements in First Timothy are consistent with the lax imprisonment at Cæsarea; and those writers who assign it to the two years at Rome, concede this of course.

Again, Second Timothy is, by all who admit its authenticity, assigned to the time of that imprisonment which was closed by death. The advocates of the Interval theory say, this was as late as A. D. 68, five years after St. Luke ended his history recording the first imprisonment, but, as we sought to prove, not its termination. St. Luke was with him, and yet there is not a sentence from him telling of these intermediate journeys, labors, or events. There is only the shadowy inference from the passage—"at my first trial no one stood by me," on which to build this great superstructure.

It may not be said that the silence of Scripture is an absolute demonstration of the error of a theory upon questions of this nature; but its silence, where we might reasonably expect an utterance, furnishes an argument so powerful, that we must exact irresistible testimony to overthrow the presumption.

Upon no principle of just reasoning—upon no evidence of a satisfactory character, can this Interval theory, in our judgment, be sustained.

We close our remarks upon the Pastoral Epistles with the hope that our rigid adherence to what is found in the Scriptures upon the subject, will be found a surer guide than any other for the solution of the interesting questions discussed.

---

* See the route by Guericke and by Tate. Davidson, Vol. II., p. 97.

ART. VI.—THE LIFE AND THE LIGHT.

THE mode of speech, which makes Life the source of Light, is peculiar to St. John. In his Gospel we read, "In Him (Christ) was Life, and the Life was the Light of men." And again, "He that followeth after me shall have the Light of Life." And in his Epistle, "The Life was manifested and we have *seen* it."

The common usage is to reverse the terms, as though we should read, "In Him was Light, and the Light was the Life of men;" as it is often said, in the other Scriptures, that Christ is the "Sun of Righteousness" and the "Light of the world." And this, at first sight, is the natural order of thought. For Light appears to be essential to life, and that is a pale and sickly life that is deprived of its due measure of Light.

Accordingly, we say that Moses is strictly scientific in his account of Creation, when he places first the fiat—"Let there be Light"—before the appearance of the grass and trees and the herbs: and because he brings in the direct sunshine into the world before the creation of the lowest forms of animal life. And we might press the analogy very closely, from the old creation to the new, in the progressive revelation of God to man. The Light of the PROMISE of Christ's coming broke in upon the dark chaos of human sinfulness; and its tradition abode with the inorganic mass of humanity, stirring its dead molecules with a superior life, that rose to its highest development under the "day-dawn" of Judaism: and, when the Sun of Righteousness arose, "new creatures" sprang out of the dust "alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

It is true that the dispensations overlap, and it may be objected that the parable is faulty, because we cannot say that there was no true spiritual life in its highest forms, before the birth of Christ, as we can say that there was no true animal life before the sunshine, and no true vegetable life before the light. But, if the objection were never so well taken, we may reply that we never expect to parallel the Spiritual with the Physical, *ad infinitum*. It is enough that things in the earth resemble the things in the heavens.

And the objection is not well taken; because, although human

science may assert with confidence that what we call animal and vegetable life depend upon the light, it cannot assert that there was no such thing as life before the light. For what is Life? Does not its mystery baffle all inquiry? Can the philosopher tell us where vegetable life ends and animal life begins? Can he distinguish with any certainty between organic life of any sort and the activities that inspire inorganic matter? Is not the whole tendency of modern science toward a demonstration that the natural world is a living organism, instinct with subtle energies, that bear the same relation to inorganic matter that life does to organic bodies? And is not the Sun almost known to be the very Source and Fountain of these physical forces, which depend upon its rays as entirely as life does? And, if so,—if the Sun energizes all things with forces appropriate to their several capacities, why should we quarrel with the metaphor that makes Christ the Incarnate Lord, the SUN of Righteousness—inspiring inorganic humanity while it lay in the darkness of heathendom—sustaining the vegetative life of the mass of Judaism—and quickening the mobile and sentient creatures of the Gospel, as the light was manifested, by tradition, by the Abrahamic Covenant, by the Incarnation, one Life pervading all, but with a growing power, and making the Spiritual Creation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ a unit, and a living unit, as the material world is a unit, instinct with a single force proceeding from the Sun?

2. We have not been wandering from our starting point in showing thus the propriety that resides in the more common Scriptural sequence of these terms, the Life and the Light. Nor have we any thing to unlearn in attempting now to understand St. John's inversion of that sequence. For, in St. John's peculiar wording, we have a hint of a spiritual doctrine of the correlation of forces that may well engage our attention. Nor shall we have any cause to be surprised, if it shall turn out that St. John is as *scientifically* accurate as Moses, when he says of Christ, "In Him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men."

It is a well-understood fact of science that the forces of light, heat, electricity, magnetism, and chemical action, are not material, imponderable substances, pervading the interstices of duller matter, but that they are all diverse manifestations of ONE ENERGY, which flows from the Sun, as from an exhaustless fountain. You

may convert any one of these manifestations into any other. You can measure light in units of heat, and heat in units of electricity, and so on through the circle of physical forces. Hence it is as accurate to say that the heat is the light of the world, as to say that the light is the heat of the world. The terms are convertible, because the forces are convertible.

But there is one force that cannot be ignored, that will not come into the category,—the *vis viva* or force of physical life, which, while it seems to be related to all the rest, and to be inseparable from them, cannot be brought under their laws, but exhibits arbitrary phenomena of its own.

It has been the dream of philosophers for ages to identify this life-force with the other physical forces; and the recent discoveries of the unity of all forces have sometimes made it seem not impossible that science would yet succeed in isolating and examining physical life, as we see from Professor Huxley's recent lecture. And yet, again, the discovery seems as remote as ever. There is an evident *relation* between life and light, and heat and electricity, but it is not the *same* relation that exists between these, among themselves. On the contrary, the living being alone can originate all these forces, and corresponds rather to the Sun itself, than to any effects of the Sun's rays. Life seems to be rather the parent than the child of force; and what if it should hereafter appear that the Sun is the centre and fountain of this mysterious life-force, and that all these sensible phenomena which we call forces are only effects of that VITAL ENERGY? Would not this be a great and glorious parable of the remarkable inversion of terms which St. John employs? and would it not be grand to see Revelation again leading the Sciences, her handmaidens, up to a recognition of the true solution of the philosopher's notion of a soul of the universe, when it shall appear that, eighteen hundred years ago, she wrote it in a Book contrary to all human science, until now, "In Him was Life, and the LIFE WAS THE LIGHT?"

Thus, if ever, it would seem, must Science discover the mystery of physical life, not by resolving or converting it into light, or heat, or magnetism, but by identifying it with the solar energy, which produces all these phenomena, and so proving that LIFE is the source of LIGHT, and that it is as true of the physical Sun as of the Spiritual—In it is physical Life, and the Life is the Light. And

then, if the earth and all that is in it be instinct with one Life, manifesting itself in every creature and thing, 'after his kind,' we get a new significance from all those Scriptures, which personify the 'inanimate creation,' as we call it, and can understand the power of St. Paul's words, that 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, waiting for redemption.'"

There is no infidel materialism in this view; for, though we should entirely resolve the mystery of physical life, not only in its identification with the mystery of the solar energy, but in the solution of that mystery itself, we should not then have unveiled the higher mystery of spiritual life, but only paralleled it. Science and Revelation can never clash, because they regard different circles of truth; albeit, concentric circles. Nor is there any Pantheism here; for though we should admit the ancient notion of a soul of the universe, it would be but a physical soul of the physical universe, and would not touch the Christian doctrine of the "Father of Spirits." Nor is there any more of Pantheism in the one case than in the other; for there is a point where Pantheism and Revelation agree, as we find St. Paul quoting the heathen Aratus on Mar's hill. "For in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said; for we are also His offspring." The disagreement between Pantheism and Revelation lies in their respective conclusions; and what can be more antagonistic than the Pantheistic conceit of a final absorption into Brahma, and the Christian doctrine of the Judgment Seat of Christ? Pantheism destroys all Personality, while Revelation magnifies it.

There is no scientific reason why we should not believe that St. John puts terms in their true, *natural* order, when he makes LIFE the source of LIGHT rather than its effect.

3. And this opens up another step in our progress. For it must be evident we have not told the whole truth in saying that the physical world about us is a *parable* of the spiritual. It must be something more than a parable. If it were only a parable, then it could be disjoined from its interpretation and considered separately; and the too frequent divorce of Science from Religion would be excusable. A man might be a Persian and a Zoroastrian in his science without detriment to his Christianity. Christ might be left out of the physical creation, and the Sun installed in His place, as the Fountain of our physical life and sustenance.

There must be some unity more than that of correspondence between the world of matter and the world of spirit which shall justify St. Paul's words to the Colossians, that "In Him (Christ) ALL THINGS consist." There must be some means by which these physical types and images of things in the heavens are energized by the Divine Word or Logos, the Eternal Son; and so made, not original fountains and streams of physical life, but secondary causes and instruments for the conveyance of the Divine Life. We must regard the Sun not as אור light, but, מְאוֹר the receptacle of light. We must conceive of the two worlds of matter and spirit after the manner of the son of Sirach: "All things are double, one against another" (Eccles. xlii. 24), and "So look upon all the works of the Most High, and there are two and two, one against another." (Eccles. xxxiii. 15.) In a word, we must conceive of the physical world as a sacrament of the spiritual, that Christ may be discerned therein, conveying Himself mystically, by the sunshine, to plant, and beast, and man, and to the "inanimate" creation, for the sustentation of their physical life, as He conveys Himself, in the Covenant of His Church, to our souls and bodies, to preserve them unto everlasting life.

What may have been the original provision of God to ensure this dependence of all things on Christ, the Eternal Word, we cannot presume to say. We see its exponent in the Tree of Life, which stood "in the midst of the garden," and was so jealously guarded by the cherubim, after man's transfiguration. But we have no difficulty in determining what is God's appointment for the *restoration* of that dependence of all things on Christ which had been destroyed by sin, to the confusion and ruin of the world, and of man, its heir.

There was no delay on God's part. The PROMISE of Christ's Incarnation was announced in the hour of man's fall; and it was a living promise and an effectual light-giving life to man and all his world, from the first, as truly as the dawn-light is an effectual promise of the meridian sun, wakening the whole creation to activity.

And the manner of the recovery of the physical and spiritual world to Christ was as expressive of the truths which we have been considering as can possibly be conceived. We say, Christ took our nature upon Him, and we say truly. But in taking our nature, He took "of the dust of the ground" as well; and His Incarna-

tion was a glorious marriage of God with Nature, as a recovered Bride,—recovered, too, with infinite love and mercy, out of the harlotry of sin, as Ezekiel testifies; and purged, and sanctified, and restored, so that that which was Born to us was indeed "That Holy Thing."

The Incarnation of the Son of God, therefore, restores the dependence of all things on Christ; and by it *all* physical things are sanctified as vehicles and channels of God to us; so that we may glorify Him, "whether we eat, or drink, or whatever we do," and glorify Him in our bodies, as well as in our spirits.

That Incarnation brought new life into a dead and chaotic world, because in the Word made flesh was life, energizing suns and sacraments in nature and in grace, and making Christ Jesus the LIGHT OF THE WORLD, the Bread of Life, the Rock of Living Water, the only Communicator of vitality, in whom we live, and move, and have our being; without whom we have no Life in us.

Hence it is not likely that the mystery of physical life is scientifically discoverable. It is a fact of Theology, not of Science. It is wrapped up and contained in the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God, which was "a mystery wrought in the silence of God," and only announced, not explained, but announced to the wondering choirs of angels by the birth in Bethlehem. But the *fact* of a Life-force pervading the physical universe stands out as one of the immediate discoveries of science yet to be demonstrated. And so the fact of the all-reaching, all-touching, all-pervading, all-quickening power of the Incarnate Word is written upon every page of Inspiration, and lies at the root of our Christian faith. It is a fact that is not limited and contained within the Church. For Christ is "the Light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world." And as Bishop Andrews says,

"Every green thing in nature was the better for His Incarnation. 'He upholdeth all things by the Word of His Power.' He restores earth to its original uses, so that He could take of the Passover Bread, while He was yet uncrucified, and say of it, 'This is my Body,' identifying not that particular Bread with that particular substance of flesh, but Himself with all man's sustenance and life. Sanctifying, not Jordan only, but 'the element of water'—*all waters*, as the old Liturgies have it—to the mystical washing away of sin; and the final issue of His manifestation in the flesh shall be Paradise regained, and man's restoration to it, and to the Tree of Life. And thus, since His Incarnation, in which He took on Him not human nature only, but all nature, (the dust of the ground), the whole creation is turned

to sacramental uses, and, in a measure, endued with sacramental power. And all who do but see the light, or eat of the fruit of the ground, or drink of the water of any fountain, hold sacramental communion with Christ, receive Christ, to their health or to their destruction, after a similar though an inferior mystery to that which is enacted in His Church, where truly, and most truly, 'our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.'"

If, then, Christ be the Life of men, He is also and therefore the Light of men.

If there be no inward LIFE in man other than that which he derives from the Incarnation, then there is no inward LIFE in man other than the Light of Christ, "who is our Life."

As a syllogism, it stands thus:

The LIFE is the only source of LIGHT.

Christ is the only LIFE of men; therefore,

Christ is the only LIGHT of men.

And, inductively, thus:

Christ is our LIFE.

Where Christ is, the Father is.

Where the Father and the Son are, there is the Spirit, proceeding.

Where the Spirit is, there is LIGHT.

And where the LIGHT of God is, there is no superfluous candle of natural light.

In other words, man has no such thing as a conscience apart from Christ. Christ is man's inward monitor, advising and prompting by His Spirit "Every man that cometh into the world."

It is necessary here to define terms, and that somewhat at length:—

Man is a triplex being, consisting of BODY, SOUL and SPIRIT. Yet he is a Trinity—a unit.

His Body is endued with appetites and instincts. His Soul is endued with passions and judgment, or reason. His Spirit is endued with affections and—we commonly say, Conscience. It is proposed to say CHRIST. There is a close analogy and likeness between these three parts of human nature.

The appetites and instincts of the body answer to and resemble the passions and judgment of the soul. The passions and judgment of the soul answer to and resemble the affections and *conscience* of the spirit. Thus, love is a fleshly instinct, an intellectual passion,

a spiritual affection. And so closely are the three "loves" allied, that we have no separate terms by which to distinguish them without adjectives.

Moreover, it is hard to distinguish practically in any manner; for the three overlap upon one another, and blend one with another inextricably.

The physical instincts of brutes are rational, within certain limits. The reason of a savage heathen is spiritual in its higher reaches; not actually, but apparently and approximately.

The physical instincts, in men and beasts alike, distinguish and obey, or violate, the dictates of propriety, which is the moral code of Reason. The classification of clean and unclean beasts, in the Levitical Law, is founded upon this difference of physical behaviour and character. The dove and the swine are the extremes of physical purity and impurity; modesty and immodesty.

So the rational soul, by entertaining considerations of propriety and shamefacedness, repeats, in its way, the spiritual faculty of discerning good from evil. The Reason, as such, has nothing to do with Moral Science, except to understand it. And, yet, it is, practically, impossible to separate intellectual and moral philosophy, without doing violence to man's deepest cravings and most clamorous necessities.

What the sense of sin is to the *spirit*, the sense of shame is to the *soul* and the consciousness of nakedness is to the *body*.

Man rises in the scale of his being, as his soul acquires dominion over his body, and sinks in the scale of his being as his body acquires the mastery over his soul. He rises to his highest elevation when his flesh and his passions are subdued to his spirit, and sinks to his deepest degradation when his spirit and his reason are given up to minister to his fleshly lusts.

So true is this, that the most temporary and accidental exaltation of one part of his nature is ennobling, or degrading, as the case may be. A man who is, very slightly, intoxicated will do shameless, and, even, brutal things, from which his reason would, ordinarily, suffice to restrain him. And a man, under strong mental excitement, will do sinful things, from which he would, ordinarily, shrink, with horror; while a man whose affections are wholly set and fastened upon things above will curb his passions and "keep under" his body.

And, as habitual indulgence in carnal and passionate pleasure degrades, by fastening a habit of submission upon the spirit, until a man has no more strength nor will to resist and reform, so a habit of self-discipline and austerity ennobles, by strengthening the higher nature to maintain and preserve its rightful supremacy, beyond the limits of the exercise.

A man who is ruled by his bodily instincts is a savage, or a brute, according to his circumstances and opportunities,

A man who is ruled by his reason and his passion is a civilized citizen, or an outlaw, according to his intent and purpose of life.

A man who is ruled by his spirit is a child of God, or, failing that, a devil. For, when the human spirit deliberately rejects Christ, Satan enters into it, as we learn from the case of Judas—and, even more plainly, from that warning parable of the return of the unclean spirit to his house, that was empty, swept and garnished.

When, therefore, we speak of Conscience, we must not confound it with any physical, or intellectual faculty, though both these mimic Conscience, as it were. For a man may be utterly devoid of Conscience, and, yet, be shamefaced and decorous, and a man may have cast propriety to the winds, and, yet, avoid the extremes of carnal indulgence, through the instincts of self-preservation.

The first effect of true religion as a civilizer is, to teach man to cover his nakedness. Its next reach is, to make him careful of propriety. Its last is, to make him *pure.*

Now, there is but one instant, in the history of our race, in which we can study man in a state of utter separation from the indwelling Christ, and that is the moment of what is aptly termed the FALL, when man's spiritual being fell away from the union with Christ, its Life, and received the sentence of death in itself.

In that moment, when man was without Life, he was, also, without Light.

No one can read the brief account in Genesis without being impressed with the fact of the entire absence from Adam of any *sense of sin.* His answer to the voice of the Lord God is the answer of a self-confident equal, taken at an overwhelming disadvantage. "I heard Thy voice, and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself."

There is the instinctive *physical* impulse seeking a covering.

"They sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons." These are the *rational* impulses of fear and shame. But there is not a word of consciousness of *sin*, nor of repentance. The theory of Irenæus, and others, that the aprons of fig leaves were put on as a symbol of penitence sounds like a theory after the fact. Both Adam and his wife appear as intelligent brutes, conscious of having given offence, and expectant of retribution, but utterly devoid of any perception of guiltiness, and, equally, of any emotion of penitence.*

All nobleness and dignity disappear in them, and the physical instinct of self-preservation, and the rational passion of selfishness, alone, govern their conduct. Adam excuses himself by accusing his wife; his wife accuses the Serpent. The Serpent, himself, is a nobler animal than they, in that he receives his doom in silence.

That man was, at that moment, lost to Christ, and Christ to him, is touchingly intimated in that cry of the voice of the Lord God, "Adam, where art thou?" It was the voice of man's beloved saying: "Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove." It is Christ, seeking His Bride, our nature, as in Solomon's Song.

That Adam, apart from Christ, was without conscience of sin, is farther shown by the nature of the Lord's challenge, "Who told thee that thou wast naked?" Referring Adam to the memory of his former dependence upon Christ in purity, when "they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed."

"The eyes of them both had been opened," but by a new teacher. There is no appeal to Adam's conscience, but only to his memory. God does not charge him with sin, but with shame and nakedness. He addresses Himself to the rational animal, before Him, and not to man's spiritual affections or perceptions.

Now this is the only practical example of what man is, apart from Christ, that we can possibly have, and, as it exhibits man under the influence of death, so it exhibits him as walking in *darkness*. Deprived of the LIFE of Christ, he is, also, without LIGHT. He discerns nothing, beyond a vague consciousness of impending retribution, for a rational transgression. He manifests nothing, beyond an instinctive effort at self-preservation and self-covering.

---

* For incidental confirmation of this view see Elliott's Destiny of the Creature—"Death."

In losing Christ, he has lost his Conscience. He retains his spiritual faculties as a form. But the Light that was their soul, and guided their exercise, is put out within him; they teach him nothing, they guide him nowhere. He falls back upon his lower nature for direction and guidance—his body, with its instincts;—his soul, with its passions,—*until* the WORD OF THE PROMISE, the quickening, inspiring, regenerating WORD restores Christ to him. Then his spiritual affections, which have been sitting, helplessly, in the dark, arise and grasp Christ, by faith. Adam becomes, again, a man with a Conscience. He acquires a capacity of repenting, a disposition to recover himself, and he betakes himself to sacrificial and atoning acts, as by a spiritual instinct.

Volumes have been written concerning the origin of sacrifices; long and labored treatises to show that they were of divine appointment,—that the "coats of skins," with which the Lord God clothed Adam and his wife, were skins of beasts, slain for the first sacrifice. And there is no objection to these arguments; indeed, they are necessary to this very doctrine of Conscience. But they only tell a half-truth. The commandment to offer sacrifice would have taken no deeper hold upon man's obedience than the commandment to abstain from flesh—food, if it had been nothing but a positive commandment,—if it had not found an echo and recognition in the deeper recesses of man's spiritual being, illuminated, now, by the Life-giving PROMISE. Whatever else man afterward failed of performing, he never failed of sacrificial acts. Whether he sacrificed to devils or to God, he, perpetually, sacrificed. It is the instinct of a nature, restored to consciousness and perception, that has discerned its own sinfulness, and seeks to deprecate, to propitiate, to make satisfaction for its own deficiencies, by offering of its best; being ready to give "its first-born for its transgression, the fruit of its body for the sin of its soul." It is continually asking, "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil?" It asks the same question, it seeks the same end, in Jew and Gentile, alike. The fact of sacrifices, as it is an objective monument to the truth of Revelation, is, also, a subjective witness to the regeneration of man by the Word of the PROMISE restoring Christ to him. The instant man is "made alive again unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord," he begins to move in sympathy with the Divine purpose. He resorts to the

same device, for putting away sin, that God has fore-ordained from the foundation of the world. He does it, not only obediently, under a commandment, but, instinctively, when the commandment is forgotten. He catches a shadowy glimpse of God's perception of the nature of sin, and its only remedy. He resorts, always and everywhere, to the substituted victim—the substituted life—for reconciliation and satisfaction. He anticipates the sacrifice of Calvary—with pious, reverent, intelligent faith, seeking a spotless lamb, an unyoked heifer, a male without blemish; or, with ignorant zeal, offering swine's flesh and unclean beasts, or, with horrible and frightful burlesque, offering human life itself—but, always, anticipating Calvary, according to his privileges and his knowledge, and his will to serve God.

Now, if CONSCIENCE be of any value as a monitor, it must discern the same distinctions of right and wrong that God discerns, and if the sense of sin in man be the reflection of God's hatred of sin, the sacrificial instinct in man is the reflection of God's purpose of destroying sin by the sacrifice of His Son, and we have identified the most enduring and indelible dictate of Conscience, with the grandest and most central purpose of God, in man's creation, the destruction of sin by sacrifice.

Christ indwelling in Human Nature as the LIFE of men is also the LIGHT of men. Coming to do God's will, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, He suffuses man's spiritual being with the sacrificial instinct. Man not only discerns right from wrong, sin from holiness, but resorts to the fore-ordained remedy against sin. Christ, the Lamb slain, is the sacrifice. The indwelling of Christ in man is the subjective origin of sacrifice. The universality of sacrifice is the evidence that Christ has taken hold on man's *nature*, in its original elements, and not simply on the personal being of individual men. The history of sacrifice is the history of crucified Christ striving in human nature to accomplish His One, Full, Perfect, and Sufficient Sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, of Himself once offered, and never finding a fit instrument until the hour of His Incarnation in the womb of the Blessed Virgin.

And, if man in the dreadful hour of his Fall from Christ were without a Conscience, and if, in the first moment of his restoration by the Word of the Promise, he displayed the highest conceivable Conscience; one that not only discerned God's distinction between

sin and holiness, but grasped also at God's provision for the destruction of sin and the triumph of holiness, we have the strongest warrant for concluding that the human Conscience is no independent power, but the indwelling Christ, and that the Life is the Light and the only Light of men.

And to this agree the Scriptures, which, while they recognize the fact of the existence of a spiritual Life in man, ascribe it to Christ, "By whom all things consist;" which, while they recognize a spiritual Light in man, ascribe it to the Spirit of Christ; which, while they recognize virtue in man, call it "the fruit of the Spirit." There were love, joy, peace in the world before Pentecost. But love, joy, peace—whatsoever things are pure, lovely, and of good report—are the fruit of the Spirit, always, everywhere. "There is none that doeth good of himself."

We have put one side of the truth strongly, and without qualification. We shall present the "counter-truth" in another paper—the relation of the Inward Light to the outward revelation. The distinction between Christ pervading our nature and Christ manifested to our personal consciousness and faith is the distinction which disciples of the Inward Light invariably overlook. Life is more than the source of Light; it is the source of all *power*, of all force. Christ must be regarded objectively as the Sun of Righteousness before we comprehend salvation. He is in us, but He is also out of us. He pervades us, but He is also revealed to us.

ART. VII.—THE LITERATURE OF THE AGE OF REVOLUTIONS.

THE Literature of the eighteenth century was outward and finite:—outward in the absence of a deep penetration into the heart and mind of man; and finite in its subjects, and the arbitrary laws of style and verse to which it was confined. A philosophy of sensualism, a morality of expediency, and a poetry of fancy and "creamy smoothness," characterized the age. Instead of the untutored melody of the nightingale, the music of its poets was the measured cadence of an opera singer. Now and then some caged bird, like Goldsmith, fluttering against its bars, uttered a few sweet notes of nature, but as the poor thing was either vapid or

unheard, its voice soon sank into silence. Literature was slumbering on a bed of down, and the French Revolution, like a thunder-storm, awoke it to action. The clouds had been gathering for years, the atmosphere had grown thick, and the calm began which invariably precedes the convulsion of the elements. Nor was it a local sirocco, which affected only a small section of country, but a tempest that overspread the whole heavens, and shook with its violence the combined nations of Europe. It bore around the world the cry of the people for reason and liberty—for a freedom from unequal taxation, from the tyranny of a privileged aristocracy, from a debased clergy and a feeble and licentious monarchy. The philosophy of the Encyclopedists had encouraged a desire for what was called the primitive state of society. The public press called for equality and the rights of man. The people, demanding vengeance, rebelled and conquered. One after another, the middling and commercial classes of England rose into importance. Slavery was abolished. The nobility, driven from the battlements, retired to the citadel, and became at once more exclusive and more desirous of reform, and the condition of the agricultural poor was searched into and alleviated. On all sides the cry went up, "The man must have his due."

It is this victory of humanity which makes a unity out of all the diverse elements of the French Revolution, and constitutes the essential point of departure between the literature of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries.

It is our aim to show that the growth of a democracy which was so marvellously promoted by the French Revolution has been the source of all the various currents of our literature. It gave, in the first place, an impetus to every popular mode of thought, to every popular form of expression, and to every popular variety of knowledge. In the language of Shelley, "The most unfailing herald, companion and follower of the awakening of a great people to work a beneficial change in opinion or institution, is Poetry." It is Poetry which teaches the attributes of humanity, the sensibilities, the imagination, the inner recesses of the soul, rather than the reasoning powers or the discursive understanding; and never were these regions more thoroughly surveyed or more lovingly studied than during the thirty years immediately succeeding the French Revolution.

The field also of the Novel, or poetic prose, which is more than all others the people's property, became enlarged; the plot was more finely developed, the language chastened, and the lists entered by such a multitude of authors as was never known before. Beginning with Waverly, it rose to an influence second to no variety of literature, and, under the veil of amusement, became a vehicle for communicating the highest religious truths, the finest affections, and the brightest perceptions of the mind.

The first effect of raising man from his degradation was a withdrawal of thought from the court to the lower grades of society, and thence to animated but irrational nature.

Wordsworth said of his own poems that "humble and rustic life was generally chosen, because in that condition the passions of the heart find a better soil in which they can attain their maturity,—are less under restraint, and speak a plainer and more emphatic language; and because in that condition of life the passions are incorporated with the beautiful and permanent forms of existence."

Man, for what he was himself, for his inborn dignity, for what his great Creator had given him, became the universal theme of Poetry. Compare any of the representative minds of this period with those of the preceding century, and the difference is manifest. There is no regard for humanity in Pope or Dryden. They are in court ruffles, with all the elegance and formality of the ball room. They never look at any common man except with the coldness of an affected sympathy. The authors of the Lyrical Ballads, on the other hand, of the Sibylline Leaves, and even the melancholy Keats and Shelley, breathe a different atmosphere. The misanthropic Byron also, caring for no one but himself, is forced by the fashion of his age to pass a beautiful tribute to man and liberty in the Prisoner of Chillon. And at the extreme end of the pole. Crabbe, with a theory that is open to criticism, has made verses out of the filth of the workshop and the horrors of the dungeon.

Outward and inward nature are so closely allied, that in all schools of Poetry the two are co-existent.

> "Enraptured art draws from those sacred springs
> Streams that reflect the poetry of things."

During the first part of this century the world was upturned for its wealth of beauty and imagery. The lake, the brook, the moun-

tain, the tiniest flower of the wayside, became subjects for the verses of enraptured poets. It was a noble revival in Poetry—one that opened a grand field of thought, of sentiment, and of deep spiritual lessons.

Apart from the wit and brilliancy which may be embodied in it, the very essence of Poetry consists, as Jeffrey writes, "In the fine perception and vivid expression of that subtle and mysterious analogy which exists between the physical and moral world—which makes outward things and qualities the natural types and emblems of inward gifts and emotions; or leads us to ascribe life and sentiment to every thing that interests us in the aspects of external nature."

But however true this theory, and in spite of its beautiful expression, the results are dangerous, and the grounds of those who closely follow it, treacherous.

No one appreciated the natural world more than Shakspeare, and he has never fallen into Pantheism,—but almost the entire literature of the nineteenth century is imbued with it. Traces of it are found in such lines of Pope as those beginning,

"Vital spark of heavenly flame,"

but it became extinct, until the philosophy of the Revolution and an excessive, absorbing, love of nature, brought it into new life. It can be perceived gradually growing from such expressions as "mingling in the universe," and the frequent apostrophes to natural objects, and personifications, to the open avowal of Tennyson in his last poem. Such words as the following, written by the Christian poet, Wordsworth, would never have been found fifty years before his day:

"Whate'er exists hath properties that spread
Beyond itself, communicating good,
A simple blessing, or with evil mixed;
Spirit that knows no insulated spot,
No chasm, no solitude; from link to link
It circulates, the Soul of all the World."

The rights of man, and the tenets of socialism maintained by the French Revolution, having in them that which encouraged vanity and individualism, led to the ego-ism and subjectiveness of this era. For when a man's thoughts are concentrated upon himself by some idea of personal and inviolate right, the evils which

have been mentioned almost invariably arise. While sympathizing with all that is good and great in our country and age, we must yet confess they have become a distinguishable feature of American life, and have penetrated all forms of thought and expression in our century. In these days men consider things from their own standpoints, or from the peculiarities of their own disposition. Byron looked at the dreadful, sinning side of man, Keats at the melancholy, and Wordsworth at his tender, religious nature. The majority of our critics, like Jeffrey, in his review of the Excursion, never put themselves in the author's place, but judge according to their peculiar turn of thinking. There is none of that universality of Shakspeare which grasps the whole of his subject with the impartial hand of a great Genius. We can expect no encouragement for the Drama in such an age; for the Drama is essentially objective in its character, and does not admit of that introspective treatment which Talfourd, Coleridge, Byron and others have given it.

The convulsion and confusion of society produced by the conflict between men and noblemen during the Revolution—the overthrow of everything ancient—the exaltation of reason in strange union with passion, combined with the loose speculations of French philosophers, reflected upon many English minds a spirit of skepticism, and developed a poetry of fancy and sensuality. It was a school which led captive the weak minds of poetasters and the young, a school of elegant libertinism which attacked with its filthy arrows the Deity himself. The examples which would best illustrate its sentiments would only deface our pages.

But the violence of that mighty movement which upturned the subsoil of the mind and left men thinking and loving, is over, and the final results of a democratic literature are showing themselves.

Literature has ceased to be centralized, and in close communion with the benefits at first derived from it, and the elevation of an intelligent public, has led to manifest evils. To use the forcible metaphor of Coleridge, "During the days of Chaucer and Gower our language might be compared to a wilderness of vocal reeds, from which the favorites only of Pan and Apollo could construct even the rude *syrinx*, and from this the constructors only could elicit strains of music. But now, partly by the labors of sucessive

poets, and in part by the more artificial state of society and social intercourse, language, mechanized, as it were, into a barrel-organ, supplies both instrument and music."

The people are surface judges; they are most often as contented with an egg-shell as with an egg. The poetry for the populace is a poetry of fancy and sensibility; and the prose consists chiefly in exciting or amusing subjects, illustrated by bright metaphors, tender, humorous and sparkling wit. We are not surprised, in such an age, at a greedy devouring of short essays, heart-rending novels, sensational histories, trashy biographies, and ravings about spiritualism, orthodoxy, religion, and everything of this sort.

We can look for little pure and classical prose,—such as is found in the days of Addison, and in poetry, the universal tendency of democracy to lawlessness was shown from the very beginning of the era in the absence of the elegant and strictly accurate lines of such poets as Pope and his contemporaries.

The distaste of the masses for learning has in it two opposite effects. It causes either an entire neglect of reading, as was generally the case among the early writers of this century—a fact which has lessened the durability of their works—or else as we find at the present time, authors become mere memorizers, instead of searchers after truth.

In this antipathy to thorough knowledge can be traced the reaction against the constant allusions made during the eighteenth century to the Greek and Latin authors. Yet, as respects our language, with the assistance of the renewed interest taken in the Elizabethan Literature, it has worked a favorable change, by restoring to its proper position the Saxon element, which is essentially the people's tongue.

What can we expect of *philosophy* during an age like the present?

When profundity is so much decried the soul of profundity is assailed with the choicest popular weapons, as being visionary and unpractical. Philosophy is engaged chiefly in discovering the errors of former writers, rather than in bringing to light any new truth.

The sensualism of Locke was overthrown by the shock it received from the Revolution, and by the study of the German school, and the restoration of the English Church to new power.

But no sooner had the spiritual philosophy taken its place than the impulse given to science introduced Positivism, which now ranks first in the latest history of philosophy and is handed from periodical to periodical of our literature.

In history, however, for other reasons, we find a different result. The Revolution gave such a shock to all society and government that a renewed interest was shown in these matters, and the archives of nations were explored to their farthest corner. Moreover, a democratic age, by permitting greater political privileges to the people, encourages in them the desire for a knowledge of the principles of government, and the fate of different national politics. If history in the present century has not the dignity and deep learning of Gibbon, or the chaste language of Hume, it can boast of the accurate detail of Hallam, the critical powers of Motley, and the elegant Saxon style and brilliant descriptions of Froude.

For the discussion, however, of historical events, and for the criticism of society, morals and literature, the usual form of composition is the Review, which from the beginning of the century has afforded a channel for communicating the deepest thought, the brightest fancies, and noblest sentiments of the age. Perhaps nothing illustrates more clearly the influence of the people upon our literature than the birth of the Review. It has called forth an elegant and brilliant style. Its varied subjects, its short articles, and its periodical publication correspond exactly to all the requirements of a popular taste.

The diffusion of knowledge which has led to a multiplication of books, while it undermines the sources of originality, draws the attention to a great diversity of objects and vaporizes the mental powers. It has introduced upon the stage of literature a countless multitude of authors, among whom woman has played her part with a prominence which was unknown before the Revolution.

This multitudinous crowd of writers, pushing each other aside, and striving for the topmost place in the public favor, has degraded learning to a trade, and is aiming its blows at every pure and exalted sentiment left us. The books which it publishes are utilitarian in their views and foster the germs of that materialism which is so prevalent an evil in our recent literature.

It is the practical which such men call for, in these days of

practical railroads, practical telegraphs, and practical manufactories. The result is a skepticism about truths which cannot be explained by natural laws. It has produced such writers as Martin Jewitt, Baden Powell and the contributors to the Westminster Review, who have attacked with their arguments revelation, the Church, and the Creator Himself.

It must not be considered that of all the unlimited peculiarities, the discordant elements, the astounding advances and degradations of the literature of this era, the democratic spirit of the French Revolution was the one moving cause. Its influence has been shown in leading to a greater love of mankind and of nature, in producing a philosophy of Pantheism and materialism, in causing a subjective method of thought, and, finally, in debasing thorough culture and originality. Other forces, however, such as the German school of learning, have powerfully affected the century; but the popular movement seems to have been the interpenetrative spirit of every conspicuous advantage or injury which has followed the eighteenth century. It is the type-form of all those varieties of style and subject which are scattered over the literary world, and, as the years go on, the hidden corners of our literature are all illuminated by that central light of the Revolution—the freedom of the people.

Art. VIII.—ITALIAN UNIVERSITIES.

Before proceeding to the immediate subject of this Article we propose to trace briefly the rise of European Universities. Their origin must be referred to the twelfth century. The first Crusade had proved the cause of an unusual intellectual excitement. Its result was the introduction into Europe of Oriental learning, and more especially the treasures of Arabian scholarship. Cathedral and monastic institutions of course dated much earlier, and here we may remark that the original application of the word University has been often mistaken. In Bishop Coppleston's reply to the calumnies of the Edinburgh Review respecting Oxford, it has been inferred that he took a University to signify a number of colleges united into a single corporation. The passage quoted does not support the conclusion. Again, the term has been considered

to imply simply a place of universal learning, as stated by the Dean of Durham in his history of the Church, and as previously taught by Mosheim. In this view, while the Academy confined its instruction to particular branches of science, the University embraced the whole circle of learning. But this, as Mr. Malden observes, is a mere quibble upon the word. In the language of the Civil Law all corporations were called *Universities*, as forming a whole out of many individuals. By this application of the word to the teachers and learners of the University of Paris, as probably made by Pope Innocent the Third, they were recognized as forming an organized body, and not merely an assemblage of individuals. There is an instrument of earlier date, in the reign of King John, A. D. 1201, in which the term is applied to Oxford. It came subsequently to be restricted to places of general education where degrees were conferred. These centres of learning originated in the voluntary efforts of scholars who began to lecture in different cities, and on various branches of knowledge, and thereby attracted around them many pupils. Thus, in a short account of the University of Padua it is mentioned that the "Studio" commenced in schools taught by masters having no public authority. Professors increased in numbers and reputation. Students multiplied. The "Studio" became famous. A University was the result. Other institutions of the period had, most probably, a similar history.

The faculty of Arts was evidently the most ancient department of the old Universities, while other and higher studies were soon superadded. Paris became distinguished for Theology; Bologna for Law; Salerno for Medicine. The custom of conferring degrees seems to have arisen at the first of these celebrated institutions. In the beginning, as stated in an epistle of Abelard, whoever considered himself to have made sufficient progress in learning, if only he could attract an audience, took upon himself to expound the books of the Old and New Testaments. As might have been foreseen, many became lecturers who were ignorant of the very elements of Divinity. To remedy this evil, theological teachers of higher reputation united themselves into a society, and established a rule that no one should teach without their sanction. This led to a public examination of the candidates, and a formal ceremony of induction. Early in the thirteenth century a similar

arrangement prevailed in the Faculty of Arts. A reform appears to have been carried into the University of Paris by Innocent the Third. One of the regulations made by this Pope provided that no one should read, or lecture in Arts who had not been a hearer for six years, and passed a formal examination. It was also enjoined that candidates for this privilege must be more than twelve years of age, which seems to show that in those days the nursery and the University were sometimes brought into close contact.

It soon followed that degrees were conferred after regular examinations in all the Faculties, and Nicholas the Fourth, who was Pope from 1287 to 1294, granted the University of Paris that persons who had been approved there as Doctors should have the right to teach and lecture, and direct public schools in all other places. To obtain similar privileges in all Universities the Papal confirmation had to be solicited. It was only as legatee of Rome that the Archbishop of Canterbury, before the Reformation, possessed the power of conferring degrees. When the authority of the Vatican had been thrown off, Cranmer informed Gardiner of his intention to make a visitation as metropolitan, and was denied the right by that Bishop of Winchester, until authorized by an act of Parliament.

At the beginning of the fourteenth century the commencing doctors were in the habit of indulging in great ostentation and expense when admitted to their degrees. To correct this evil Pope Clement the Fifth published an edict of the Council of Vienna. The excess arose, as we infer, from the entertainments the candidate was expected to give, from the necessity of providing a gown and robe of ermine for himself, with gown, cap, and ring for the Bishop and each of the doctors whom he had selected to present him for his degree, and also gloves for the other doctors, and similar expenses.

The whole system of degrees seems to have originated at Paris, as might have been expected from its venerable antiquity. This view is confirmed by the use of the word *bachelor*, which was everywhere employed to designate the lowest degree bestowed by each Faculty, and appears to have been peculiar to the feudal, or military law of France. The knight *bachelor* was distinguished from the knight *banneret*, who had the right to unfurl his banner, and who not only was arrayed in arms himself, but, through the

greatness of his possessions, or reputation, brought followers into the field. On the contrary, the former simply provided for himself, and the moderate estate necessary for his equipment was called a *baccalare*, whence the term *baccalarius*, with its academical use, was taken metaphorically, and indicated a graduate of the lowest rank. The titles *Master*, *Doctor*, *Professor* were originally identical, signifying, according to their obvious meaning, persons engaged in teaching. However, in process of time, the first became appropriated to instructors in the liberal Arts; the second to those in Theology and Law; and the last to lecturers on some particular subject.

Licentiates were not entitled to lecture without permission from the Rector of the University, and this permission was sometimes accorded to simple scholars after diligent study for five or six years, for which, however, a fee had to be paid proportionate to the magnitude of the department. At Padua Bachelors of Law or Medicine were created by a Doctor or Master, without the intervention of any public authority. The Licentiates did not differ from Doctors except in the fact that they were not entitled to the gown. In the year 1656 a regulation was made to mark the merit of graduates, that if a degree was not obtained by the unanimous consent of the Faculty, the fact should be stated in the diploma, which was to be drawn up in a less honorable form, and written on paper instead of parchment. This regulation occasioned in the year following the death of a lecturer on the theory of medicine, Guido Antonio Albanese, a man of noble rank, who was assassinated. His murderer was publicly outlawed by the civil authorities, and is stated to have died in prison by poison supplied by his relatives, to avoid the ignominy of a public execution.

It has been noticed by Mr. Malden as a remarkable peculiarity of the University of Bologna that females were admitted to its honors and offices. There is mention in early times of learned women who received degrees. Novella d'Andrea is said to have read lectures on jurisprudence, drawing, however, a curtain between herself and her auditors. Mrs. Piozzi speaks of La Dottoressa Laura Bassi, who taught mathematics and natural philosophy; and Lady Morgan, of Signora Clotilda Tambroni, a learned professor of Greek; while Madonna Manzolina even lectured on Anatomy. In the University of Padua there is a statue

of Ellena Lucretia Connaro, who obtained the degree of Doctor, or rather Doctress of Philosophy on June 25th, 1678. She is spoken of as a very celebrated young lady, who was highly esteemed for her amiability, angelic manners, and much admired for her learning, and who died with the reputation of sanctity.

As in ancient times Paris was the University most famous for the study of Theology, and Bologna for Law, so was Salerno for Medicine. The Constitutions of the Emperor Frederic II, for the regulation of medical practice in his paternal dominions, supply us with information as to the prescribed course of study in the thirteenth century in this University and that of Naples, which latter was founded by himself. Before entering on the study of medicine a three years' study of logic was required, though surgery might be learned at an earlier period. This, however, had to be studied at least a year, and a knowledge of the anatomy of human bodies had to be acquired in the schools. The medical course was to last five years, during which the Masters were to teach in the schools the authentic works of Hippocrates and Galen, both in theoretical and practical medicine. The student who had passed through this course, and desired to practice medicine, had then to be approved by the Masters in the full assembly of the University. After this examination, he received written testimonials, both of the Masters and others who had taken a degree, of his having studied the requisite time, and of his competent knowledge and general good character. With these, by which the academical degree was conferred, he was to appear before the King, or in his absence, of the Viceroy, and obtain a license to practice; and any one who presumed to attempt the healing art without having fulfilled these conditions was liable to the confiscation of his goods and a year's imprisonment. The same process was required for a license to practice surgery, except that the time of study appears to have been shorter; and when all this had been gone through, the new physician was required to practice for a year under the direction of an experienced brother. The Constitution of Frederic forbade any one to lecture on medicine or surgery except at Salerno or Naples, and prescribed that no one should take the title of Master without having been carefully examined by the Masters of Medicine and the officials of the Crown, who were probably some dignitaries entrusted with the superintendence of the Universities.

Salerno possessed a school of Law, but no mention is made of Philosophy or Theology. The University itself fell into decay from the neglect or discouragement of the Sovereigns, and long before the seventeenth century not a trace of it was left behind. The degrees of the University of Naples were never recognized in other Universities, probably for want of the Papal authority, its founder having been denounced as an enemy of the Church.

Having sketched in general the rise of European Universities, and described more particularly the ancient regulations of those in Italy, we are prepared to consider some recent remarkable changes introduced in that country. In the year 1862 an interesting and able debate took place in the Chamber of Deputies at Turin on the subject of the great national institutions of learning, and the means to be adopted for their improvement. All the speakers seemed to allow that the country was overstocked with these establishments, which was occasioned by the fact of its having until very recently comprised so many independent States, each of which naturally thought it desirable to be furnished with an University within its own borders. They were described as being generally in a very unsatisfactory condition. Studies had declined, the professors were not equal to their work, and a great lack of discipline was commonly prevalent. Complaint was made that neither by the students, nor their parents, did the Universities appear to be regarded as places of moral and intellectual training, where the minds of those who resorted to them were to be elevated by a course of liberal studies, and stored with valuable acquirements, but simply as institutions for conferring degrees; and so it was no uncommon thing for those who had studied, or proposed to study, in one University, towards the end of their course, to remove to another, where the examinations were easier and the graduating fees lighter than in their own. Shortly before this was stated, thirty students had gone from Pavia to Emilia on this very account. It will be readily perceived how impossible it must have been to maintain anything like academical discipline, where such a practice was allowed. Instances were also mentioned, in which, for the sake of saving money and time, it had been attempted by means of cramming, and entering the name on the class-list of professors whose lectures it would be impossible to attend, to get through a course of studies allotted to four or five years in two or three, to

the great injury of both the bodily and mental powers of those who made the attempt. It will be readily supposed that a degree sought with such feelings and by such means could not possess much intrinsic value; and, accordingly, one of the speakers declared that the diploma with which it was accompanied, instead of being a reliable attestation of the attainments of its possessor in the faculty wherein he had graduated, was in the case of at least a third of those who received it nothing better than a piece of paper which served to conceal their ignorance.

"I was present," said Signor Matteucci, the Minister of Public Instructions, "at a medical examination in the University of Naples"—the largest, by the way, in Italy, containing more than 9,000 students. "The examination was conducted with closed doors. The President of the Board of Examiners said to me: 'Is the Minister satisfied?' I put my head between my hands, and made a sign of being so, whereas, in reality, I could only blush. 'There are great difficulties,' it was observed by another speaker, the President of the Council, 'in the way of having strict examinations, and I repeat it for the hundredth time that none but distinguished and energetic professors, who have a high sense of their own dignity, and the courage to brave unpopularity with the students, make their examinations a serious work.'"

These difficulties consisted in the want of satisfactory schools preparatory to the Universities, in the inability to secure the attendance of the students at the Professors' lectures, and in the deficiency of well qualified Professors, which last was chiefly occasioned by the inadequacy of their remuneration. They would appear to have been appointed to their chairs by public competition, at an examination conducted *viva voce*. Many of these examinations, however, are described to have been of such a character as would have made even a young student blush. So great was the ignorance of many of the candidates, that it was found necessary to have a previous examination in private, and in writing, in order to prevent them from making a public exhibition of their incompetence.

There can be no question that institutions in such a condition were in urgent need of a thorough reform; but still it is satisfactory to find that they had among their sons men equal to the work. The debate from which we have extracted these details affords evidence of this. We believe that all who took part in it were University men, and some were or had been *officially* connected with

one or the other University. They differed, indeed, aswas to be expected, in their opinions of the various measures proposed, but there was amongst all a breadth and intelligence of view, a lively perception of existing evils and deficiencies, a keen sensibility to the fallen condition of their country in respect of learning, and an earnest desire that she should once more stand forth in that literary and scientific glory with which she was adorned in former days. In fact, the speeches delivered on this occasion might well bear comparison with any that would be called forth under similar circumstances in any nation of Europe; and may we not attribute this, at least in part, to the University training received by the speakers?

During the last century and the early portion of this, the English Universities were, as places of education, most inefficient; and yet, even in their darkest days, the influence they exercised over the learning and culture of the nation was by no means inconsiderable. It seems, therefore, only just to mete with the same measure the Universities of Italy and those of England, and what we know of the latter, unhesitatingly to infer of the former.

It was mentioned in the course of this debate that in order to give effect to a previous law relating to the Universities, enacted by the Parliament, a regulation (*regolamento*) had to be drawn up, which work was entrusted to a commission. When, however, it was completed, instead of being forthwith communicated to the Faculties of the different Universities, it was forwarded by command of the Minister to an *Accademia* in order that it might contain no word or sentence inconsistent with the purest Italian; and this regard for the correctness of its phraseology actually occasioned the opening of the University sessions to be delayed for a month!

In consequence of this debate, a series of thirty-five questions was drawn up and transmitted to the Universities, which, from the answers returned by the various Faculties, appear to have been carefully considered. Our space would not allow us to give anything like an adequate idea of either the questions themselves, or the answers which they received; but one or two we will briefly touch upon by way of specimen.

The second question on the list is the following: "Ought the Faculty of Theology to be continued in all the Universities? or

will it be sufficient to establish this Faculty in one or two of the Universities of the Kingdom—or, perhaps, to found instead, in the future capital of the Kingdom a great theological, biblical, linguistic Institute, by agreement with the supreme authority of the Church?" This last suggestion met with general favor, though some few of the Faculties were opposed to it; but with regard to the continuance of the Faculty of Theology in the Universities, it was replied by the Faculty of Medicine and Surgery in the University of Naples, that "those doctrines were taught in the Universities which afforded opportunity for free discussion, and that it was not possible to teach any other theology than what formed a part of Philosophy." The Faculty of Natural Sciences in the same University was of opinion that "the State ought not to have an official University Theology;" and answers to the same effect were given by other Faculties of other Universities, whilst the Faculty of Medicine and Surgery at Pisa declared itself incompetent to give a reply. On the other hand, the Faculty of Philosophy and Philology at the same University considered that "the Faculty of Theology ought to be maintained, since the problems and scientific investigations of natural reason are enlarged and perfected by Revelation and the teachings of Authority; and therefore he who would take away the Theological Faculty from a complete course of University instruction, would deprive the other Faculties of their completeness, and, so to speak, of their consecration." The Medical and Surgical Faculty at Catania replied that, "in a Catholic kingdom, more than elsewhere, the Theological Faculty ought to be preserved in all the Universities, because theological subjects are not less interesting and useful to Christians than others, even as a means of advancing civilization (civilta); and since religion and civilization ought to be made common to the whole nation, it is necessary that theological instruction should be diffused as widely as possible." The Faculty of Physical and Mathematical Sciences was in favor of the existence of the Theological Faculty in all the Universities of the Kingdom, for two reasons: "1st. That an enlightened and liberal theology might be introduced in opposition to the narrow, retrograde and prejudiced theology of the present Seminaries. 2d. That the best materials might be provided for the establishment of a great Institute in the future capital of the Kingdom." On this subject I have preferred to give you first the,

opinions of the secular Faculties. Those of Theology were naturally in favor of the continuance of their own department. Thus the one at Palermo says that the Faculty of Theology ought to be retained at least in the first-class Universities, since in such Universities born in non-Catholic kingdoms there are grand chairs of Theology, Morality, and Ecclesiastical History and Antiquities, to which even laymen resort, and, in England, ladies; and hence the children of error are, generally speaking, well informed on the subject of religion. And that at Pisa, "without discussing whether theological instruction should be continued in all, or in one or two Universities, would consider that it was wanting to itself, if it did not insist on the necessity of its basis, retained at the University of Pisa, to which it gave a beginning, and wherein it has flourished since its origin. Without theology the University would be destitute of that department of study, which enlightens and renders fruitful all the rest, whether philosophical, historical, literary or scientific. A society can hardly be imagined, informed and pervaded by the Christian element, if deprived of the theological element. Without its instruction, History especially becomes dumb." Of the Faculties who gave an opinion, twenty-four were in favor of the maintenance of theological instruction in all the Universities; four were for simply preserving it where it already existed; eight would have had it confined to the principal Universities; and eight thought that it should be allowed in none.

It was asked in the thirty-fourth question, the last one, "Is it thought desirable to oblige the students to wear, at academical hours, and in the University halls, a particular dress? and, if so, of what kind should it be?" In reply to this, part of the Faculty of Law at Bologna thought *not*, in any case; the other part, not, unless the dress were of a strictly academical character. The same Faculty at Naples was of opinion that it should not be required at present, but that if one were chosen, it should be that of the National Guard; whilst the Faculty of Theo'ogy at Palermo were altogether in favor of it. "At Oxford," they remark, "the students always wear their academical garb in the streets, but this would not be in accordance with Italian customs." On the other hand, the Medical Faculty of Naples simply replied that "the time for such distinctions is gone by;" the same Faculty at Pisa, "that it would be an useless annoyance to the young men,

and might prove a dangerous encouragement to the declining notions of caste and corporation, which were inconsistent with the present systems of civil equality, and apt to produce no trifling inconveniences through the restless and fickle disposition of youthful minds;" and the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy at Turin were of opinion that "it would be of no use except as a reproach to the student who did not observe propriety in his own dress, or who was guilty of smoking within the University precincts." The proposal was approved by four of the Faculties, and opposed by fifty-six.

We will not proceed farther with these questions. It will be sufficient to say that by the aid of the replies which they called forth, a body of statutes for all the Universities of the Kingdom—all, at least, in connection with the government—was drawn up by a committee appointed for the purpose, and submitted to the sovereign by the Minister of Public Instruction, Carlo Matteucci, with a very able and judicious statement of considerable length. We are sorry to state that this learned and enlightened philosopher died on the twenty-fourth of last June, at the age of 57, at Leghorn, whither he had gone for change of air and scene, and was buried in the Campo Santo at Pisa, of the University of which city he was a Professor. The statutes which he thus laid before the King received the royal sanction, and became University law. They established for all the Universities one and the same scale of fees, one and the same course of studies and examinations, thus doing away with the temptation to remove from one University to another, and indeed prohibiting a student who had failed in his examination at one to be received at another; whilst in cases of poverty, accompanied by diligence and ability, they allow the fees to be remitted. The Academical year commences on Nov. 1, and closes on Aug. 30, the months of November, July and August being set apart for examinations. The Universities are formally opened on Nov. 15. Lectures commence the day after, and are continued to the end of June. Examinations for admission and on special subjects, which appear to be annual, are held by a board of examiners, not all of whom belong to the University wherein they are carried on, who are each possessed of ten votes, and six-tenths of the whole number must be obtained by a student under examination to enable him to *pass*. If he obtain nine-tenths, he is said to be approved with full

legal votes; and should he be so fortunate as to secure all, it is then put to the vote whether it shall be recorded in his certificate or diploma, that he has passed with praise. To enable him to do this, however, it must be carried unanimously. In the case of an examination for a doctor's degree, *seven*-tenths of the votes must be obtained; and if a candidate obtain the whole number, it is further put to a division, and must, as before, be assented to by all, whether mention shall be made of the examination in the official gazette. A student so distinguished, receives a silver medal engraven with his name. The examination for this degree consists of a written essay on some subject drawn by lot, for the composition of which eight hours are allowed; and two days afterwards, after the reading of the essay, of viva voce interrogations on points principally connected with the subject treated. This part of the examination must occupy at least an hour, exclusive of the reading of the essay.

Time would not allow us to state the course of studies prescribed for each of the Faculties; but it may suffice to impart some idea of what is attempted in these Universities, if we give a brief detail of what is laid down for the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters. The course includes four years, and, to be admitted to it, it is necessary to produce a certificate from the lyceum (or grammar school), at which the applicant has been previously educated, and to pass an examination in the Italian and Latin languages and literature, in the Greek grammar, in ancient History and Geography, and in the elements of Philosophy. There are two degrees given in this Faculty—Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Letters. For the former the course prescribed is, in the first year, Latin Literature, Ancient History, Theoretic Philosophy, and Anthropology and Pedagogy; in the second, Greek Literature, Theoretic Philosophy, History of Philosophy, and Modern History; in the third, Greek Literature, Moral or Practical Philosophy, History of Philosophy, and Theoretic Philosophy; and in the fourth, Moral or Practical Philosophy, History of Philosophy, Comparative Languages and Literature, and Philosophy of History. For the degree of Doctor of Letters, the first year is occupied with Greek, Latin, and Italian Literature, Ancient History and Ancient and Modern Geography; the second, with the same, with the exception of Geography, and the addition of Modern History; the third, with the same as the

second, except that Anthropology and Pedagogy were substituted for Ancient History; and the fourth with the three languages of the previous years, together with Archæology, Comparative Languages and Literature, and Philosophy of History. Students who have passed the special examination of the second year may receive the diploma of Bachelor of Philosophy of Letters, and on passing those of the third year, that of Licentiate; and a Doctor in either department may receive the same degree in the other by passing the requisite special examinations in the subjects not common to the two courses. The diploma of Bachelor or Licentiate qualifies its possessor to become a candidate for a chair, or, as we suppose we should call it, a mastership, in either a technical or a training school, or a gymnasium, all which are under the management of the government. The course required for a Doctor's degree in Law embraces five years; in Medicine and Surgery, six; in pure Mathematics, in Physical Mathematics, in Physical Chemistry, and in Natural History, all which are included in one Faculty, respectively, four, though a Doctor in one department may obtain the same degree in another at a much earlier period in consequence of the degree he already possesses.

"It is an old and uncontradicted truth," observes Mattecci, in that memorial addressed to the King which we have already mentioned, "that in the Universities we *learn to study*,—or, in other words, that University studies cannot at once make a learned man, nor a discoverer of new truths, but ought to impress on the mind, with methodical strictness, a certain number of general facts and principles, with which to proceed either to the exercise, or to the practical study, of a profession, so that with diligent application the student may arise hereafter to fame in science or in literature."

Words to the same effect had been used long before in our own country. In a note to "The Pursuits of Literature," a work that created a great sensation at the time of its appearance, of which the eighth edition, whence I am quoting, was printed in 1798, the author says:

"I would call the rising youth of this country to the intense, and fervent and unremitting study of the ancient classical writers as their primary choice. I call upon them to have the *courage* to be ignorant of many subjects and of many authors, at their inestimable age. I exhort them affectionately, as a matter of the most serious importance, never to pretend to study in their first academical years what they design as the ultimate end of their labors—I mean their profession. Their whole business is to lay the foundation of knowledge, original, sound, and strong. In particular, the study of

the Law, *as such*, should never be entered upon, even *in limine*, before the first degree in Arts is obtained. The specific study of it in the Universities, at that early age, confines and cripples the faculties. Such a student may arrive at mere knowledge as a special pleader; but he will never be illustrious, or ornamental to his profession. I wish to observe with particular emphasis, that when a man has once entered upon any profession whatsoever, his education has in fact ceased. They who by a patient continuance and undivided attention to academical studies *alone*, have sought for the original materials of science and of solid fame, have seldom failed in their great pursuit."

Such an agreement, at periods so distant, and in countries so different, between an eminent scholar and a distinguished natural philosopher (for such was Matteucci, engaged especially in the study of electricity and other kindred subjects), is, in my opinion, very remarkable, and deserves the attentive consideration of all who are interested in the welfare and success of University education. Within the last few years great additions have been made to the branches of study pursued within them, principally of a scientific character, and intended to have reference to the future occupations of the students. But is it not to be feared that this variety of pursuits, besides rendering the knowledge acquired wanting in depth and solidity, and so incapable of forming a fitting foundation for further attainments, should, by distracting the attention, weaken the powers of the mind, and so render them unequal to the pursuit of any study requiring deep thought and patient consideration? Such is stated by the writer I have already quoted (Matteucci) to have been the effect in the University of Italy.

From the general impulse given to early education, "the students of our times," he says, "are younger than those of a former period; the number of those who cultivate the sciences is greater; industry re-acts in its turn for the perfection of scientific theories; facts are multiplied and accumulated; but all this intellectual activity prevalent with regard to the physical sciences and their application, which is the most remarkable manifestation of our times, implies no increase in the power of the intellect. From the increase of the number of Professorships which has taken place in every Faculty, it might be supposed that the intellectual powers of the student had increased in the same proportion; but this is not, and cannot be. And in the average of the young men, the consequences of this discordance are shown in a want of depth in the theoretical and substantial studies, in a certain degree of confusion in their various and imperfect acquirements, and in the insufficiency and unsatisfactoriness of the examinations. It is of no use to conceal it.

All those who have experience of University teaching, and who live among the students, are continually meeting with young men, if we except those of uncommon abilities, who have reached the end of their academical course, possessed indeed of many cursory attainments, but unable to draw strict conclusions, and deficient in the fundamental principles of the theory of the science to which they are devoted."

In addition to what is here stated, may it not be worthy of consideration, whether these sciences themselves, which have of late years met with so extraordinary a degree of favor, concerned as they are exclusively with the external world, and having for their main object the increase of wealth and temporal power, personal comfort and social convenience, have the same tendency or ability in themselves to "improve the intellectual and moral being, to correct the taste, to strengthen the judgment, and to instruct us in the wisdom of men better and wiser than ourselves," as those studies of scholarship and literature, which they have in a great measure superseded?

Universities have hitherto come before us simply as places of instruction for those who are approaching, or have just entered into, manhood; and we believe that this is the light in which they are in general exclusively regarded by even many of the better informed. How pleasing to find that no one of the speakers in the debate on which we dwelt somewhat at length in the early part of this address, presented them in a different light!

"I have," it was said, "a larger idea of the Universities than that which is generally entertained. The Universities are more than schools, more than institutes wherein are taught the subjects necessary for acquiring a profession; they ought to be truly *academies*, in which science is produced, is created. In other words, they ought to be places of retirement, wherein learned men may pursue their studies so as to become qualified, whenever occasion shall arise, to instruct their countrymen or the world on those subjects to which they have devoted themselves, and thus add to the permanent literature of their nation. In conformity with this principle, the Italian Government grants every year four exhibitions at each of the Universities of Bologna, Naples, Pavia, Palermo, Pisa, and Turin, to men who have taken a Doctor's degree within the last four years, in any University of the kingdom, in the Faculties of Law, Medicine, Physical Mathematics, and Philosophy and Letters, and have given subsequent proof of their ability and attainments by either examination or authorship, to enable them to pursue their studies for an additional period, in any place chosen by themselves, which is considered to afford special advantages for so doing. The amount of the exhibition, from one to two thousand francs, is determined by a ministerial decree, as well as

the number of years for which it is granted, and the place where the exhibitioner is to reside; and he is required to transmit every three months to the Office of Public Instruction certificates of his diligence and progress in the branch of study to which he is devoted. The neglect of this regulation is visited with admonition, suspension, and, finally, deprivation of the exhibition."

It was the same desire to promote the attainment of excellence in the pursuits of literature and science, and the same conviction that it was to be accomplished only by serious and laborious study, that led to the establishment of these exhibitions, which gave rise, in past ages, in the English Universities, to those many noble foundations, which have "afforded to the learned and studious a shelter from the bustle and distraction of the world, where they might pursue at leisure the studies which elevate their own minds, and benefit the world at large." And it is impossible to say how much England is indebted to them for what they thus effected, especially in those times when they were most taken advantage of for this purpose. Thus to give but one or two instances. Hooker, who died at the age of 46, in 1600, had resided fifteen years at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, which he left in 1582. Archbishop Laud was nearly fifty when he quitted St. John's, in the same University, in 1626, where he had lived more than thirty years. Joseph Mede died in his rooms at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1638, at the age of fifty-two, having lived in College two-thirds of his time. And Henry Moore died in 1675, aged sixty-one, in the same College, where he had resided forty-four years. It may, perhaps, excite surprise that we should mention Archbishop Laud, whom Lord Macaulay has characterized as "a poor creature who never did, said, or wrote any thing indicating more than the ordinary capacity of an old woman." Now it will be at once understood that we are not here concerned with the Archbishop's principles, political, ecclesiastical, or religious. We have simply in view his abilities and attainments as a scholar; and regarding him in this light, we feel that it is impossible to doubt that Lord Macaulay had never read a single page of the writings of the man whom he scruples not to speak of in these terms. He was evidently led to the use of such language by his political sentiments; but Dr. Parr, whom even he would have allowed to be no incompetent judge, and who would have sympathized with him to a great extent in both *politics* and religion, had formed a very different judgment. "Let

me not forget," says he, writing to Charles Butler, "the *Answer of Archbishop Laud to Fisher:* Laud investigates, Laud reasons, Laud distinguishes, Laud reviles not, and surely you and I must sympathize in holy indignation when we read that, during the infamous trial of Laud, his candor to an adversary was one topic of accusation against him." We may add that this work, his *Conference with Fisher*, the materials for which he had doubtless amassed during his residence at Oxford, is such a monument of learning, reasoning, eloquence, and moderation, as ought to ensure the highest appreciation of his literary character, even from those who, in other respects, are the most opposed to him.

Now it is much to be wished that all Universities might become the homes of a race of students like him, and those others named, to whom we might add many more. Literature was never so widely diffused and popular as it is now, but has not this come to pass through a lowering of its character? "Philosophy," it has been well said, "cannot raise the commonalty up to her level; if she is to become popular, she must sink to theirs." Surely it is to be desired that amid the bustle, and excitement, and distraction, and superficiality of the present day, men should arise who will cultivate Literature and Philosophy for their own sake, and who by hard study and patient thought will exceed the literary glory of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and thus encourage others who are competent to tread in their steps, whilst even among men of inferior powers they exercise an elevating and sobering influence!

And how important for the American Church to turn to her advantage the experience of Europe in completing her educational work! She may well study the reports of the Italian Commission as given in this Article. They really embody the wisdom of ages. The Church in this country needs a vast University which shall be the crown and glory of a system beginning with the Parish School, and rising by proper gradations to a National Institution established on a plan so solid and so liberal that it will command the admiration of our republic and of the world.

ART. IX.—ENGLISH REFORMERS AND ENGLISH PURITANS CONTRASTED.

THE struggles of the English Church, on the one hand with Romanism, and on the other hand with Puritanism, exhibit some striking analogies and some striking contrasts.

The conflict with Rome assumed its serious and aggressive form in the reign of Henry the Eighth; continued with almost uniform success under Edward the Sixth, as if about to end in a decisive triumph, when Queen Mary coming to the throne rescued Romanism from its defeat, restored it again to power, and seemingly determined the final issue of the contest against the Church of England. Then Elizabeth ascending the throne, Protestantism was saved from its discomfiture, and an advantage gained for the Church which secured victory in the completed Reformation. But hardly was this struggle ended when another began with the Puritans.

Parties which had been friends and allies in the opposition to Rome, when their purpose was accomplished, made such demands as endangered the truth now secured, and threatened the disintegration of the Church itself, and in these demands increased their zeal till a new and serious contest was inaugurated.

This new opponent began its open work in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, increased its activity and power in that of James the First, and seemed to gain the final victory under Charles the First in obtaining control of the Church and civil power. But as once before the Church was raised from the grave of defeat, so now again its life and rule were restored under Charles the Second, and its foe subjected for all time to come. The failure of the Puritans to gain their desires at the Conference of Savoy and the next Convocation, was followed by a succession of discomfitures in every attempt afterward. In the beginning of each of these struggles the Church was successful. Under King Henry the Eighth, with all the reaction and apparent retrogression of the Protestant cause, the Papal Supremacy over England had been effectually opposed and destroyed. Under Queen Elizabeth the Puritans were successfully resisted. Under Edward the Sixth the

Church seemed to complete her victory over Rome. Under James the First the demands of the Puritans were officially regarded, refuted, and refused. Under Queen Mary the power of Rome had been suddenly exalted over the Reformers; their work stayed, and seemingly undone. Under Charles the First, the Puritans, taking advantage of Civil and Ecclesiastical oppression, gained control of the Church and State, and seemed to attain security in their triumph. The reaction from Queen Mary's cruelty with the Reformers resulted in the completion of the Reformation. The reaction from the excesses and instability of Cromwell's rule saved the Church from any serious change which the Puritans sought.

Thus the English nation, before giving her final verdict on the questions of the Reformation, had the knowledge of its operations under Edward the Sixth, and the repeated experience of Roman power under Queen Mary, as, if having a trial of both, she might wisely make her final choice. That choice was for Protestantism. So in respect to Puritanism. Under Elizabeth and James the First the nation learned the workings of Protestantism as the Reformers shaped it, with its liturgy and episcopal government; and under Cromwell perceived the operations of Puritanism; that having tasted of both these systems it might wisely form a final judgment. It elected the Church of the reformation in preference to the Church of the revolution.

Such are some analogies in the struggles. Points of contrast also gain our attention.

The first conflict was with the Papacy, for self-purification—to cast off superstitions, errors and corruptions. The second, with the Puritans, was for self-preservation.

We do not mean that the Puritans sought to subvert the Protestant doctrines which the Reformers had established; but whatever their designs, the Church believed that their efforts tended indirectly to endanger that doctrine, and directly to the subversion of her present order and organization.

Further observe in the strife with Rome, the Church had but a single enemy, and could put forth her efforts without complication. But in her strife with the Puritans, her old foe, Rome, was watching, though subjected, to renew her power.

And such was the hostility of these two enemies to each other,

that it required keen discernment and careful judgment so to injure one as not to seem to be helping the other. It was like fighting one army with a second in the rear.

Another point of contrast is the *subject matter* at issue in the two struggles.

With Rome the contest respected the vital points of the Christian doctrine; the all important difference between truth and falsehood, faith and superstition; the bondage of the soul and its liberty in Christ Jesus. In the contest with the Puritans we see the subjects at issue were chiefly *forms* and *ceremonies*. The Reformers sought to purify the life of the Church; the Puritans to change her costume. It is hardly possible to exaggerate this contrast—the intrinsic and serious importance of the work done by the Reformers and the comparative trifles for which the Puritans labored.

Let the history of the two parties present this antagonism in its true colors.

We begin the history by placing side by side two characteristic papers, which from the place they fill in the disputations of the parties, may be considered as symbols of their respective and essential principles.

The first representative, in part, of the work of the Reformers, is the noted challenge of Bishop Jewell. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth he stands as a typical man in the restoration of the Church from the papal doctrines reinstated by Queen Mary. He is the chief disputant of the Protestant party, "the boldest and most uncompromising foe of Rome." In a sermon preached before the Court, at Paul's Cross, on 17th of March, 1559–60, he fearlessly challenges his enemy to a contest on the important questions at issue between them.

We select the points in this challenge as a careful *resumé* of Protestant principles at stake in his time, and by adding to them a statement of principles previously established, we make a complete exhibition of the Reformers' work. The paper which we contrast with this is the important document presented by the Puritans in the Conference of Savoy, containing their "exceptions to the Book of Common Prayer." Considering how long the Puritans had been agitating their claims, even since the reign of Elizabeth, and that they were now requested to make a statement of the same to be officially noticed and acted upon by the ecclesiasti-

cal authorities, we may conclude that they will make as strong a case as possible. Adding to this paper the increased demands afterward made by the Puritans, we shall have a fair presentation of their work and aims.

BISHOP JEWELL'S CHALLENGE.

If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the Holy Scripture of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved (1) that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time for the space of six hundred years after Christ.

(2) Or that there was any Communion ministered unto the people under one kind.

(3) Or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue that they understood not.

(4) Or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal bishop, or the head of the universal Church.

(5) Or that the people was then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the Sacrament.

(6) Or that his body is, or may be, in a thousand places or more at one time.

(7) Or that the priest did then hold up the Sacrament over his head.

(8) Or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honor.

(9) Or that the Sacrament was then, or now ought to be, hanged up under a canopy.

PROPOSALS OF THE PURITANS.

And therefore in pursuance of this his Majesty's most gracious Commission, for the satisfaction of tender consciences and the procuring of peace and unity among ourselves, we judge meet to propose.

(1) That all the prayers and other materials of the Liturgy may consist of nothing *doubtful or questioned* amongst pious, learned, or orthodox persons.

(2) That the Liturgy be so composed, as to gain upon the judgment and affection of all those who in the substantials of the protestant religion are of the same persuasions with ourselves.

(3) That the repetitions and responsals of the clerk and people and the alternate reading of the psalms and hymns be omitted.

(4) That the particulars of the Litany may be composed into one solemn prayer, to be offered by the minister for the people.

(5) That there be nothing in the Liturgy which may seem to countenance the observation of Lent as a religious fast.

(6) That the religious observation of saints-days, appointed to be kept as holy-days, may be omitted.

(7) That there be no such imposition of the Liturgy as that the exercise of the gift of prayer be totally excluded in any part of publick worship.

(8) That it may be left to the dis-

(10) Or that in the Sacrament, after the words of consecration, there remaineth only the accidents and shews, without the substance, of bread and wine.

(11) Or that the priest then divided the Sacrament in three parts, and afterwards received himself all alone.

(12) Or that whosoever had said the Sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been judged for an heretic.

(13) Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten or five masses said in one church, in one day.

(14) Or that images were then set up in the churches to the intent that the people might worship them.

(15) Or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue.

(16) Or that it was then lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely and in silence to himself.

(17) Or that the priest had then authority to offer up Christ unto His Father.

(18) Or to communicate and receive the Sacrament for another as they do.

(19) Or to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by the means of the mass.

(20) Or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that the mass, *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin.

(21) Or that any Christian man called the Sacrament his Lord and God.

(22) Or that the people was then oration of the minister, to omit part of the Liturgy, as occasion may require.

(9) That the new translation of the Scriptures be allowed by authority alone to be used.

(10) That nothing be read in the church for lessons but the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(11) That the minister be not required to rehearse any part of the Liturgy at the Communion-table, save only those parts which properly belong to the Lord's Supper, and that at such times only when the said Holy Supper is administered.

(12) That the word "minister" and not priest or curate be used throughout the whole book.

(13) That instead of the word "Sunday" the word "Lord's-day" may be everywhere used.

(14) That we may have an amended or purer version of psalms.

(15) That all obsolete words in the Common Prayer, and such whose use is changed from their first significancy, be altered.

(16) That no portions of the Old Testament or of the Acts of the Apostles be called "Epistles" and read as such.

(17) That the phrase in the several offices, such as presumes all persons within the communion of the church to be regenerated, converted and in an actual state of grace be reformed.

(18) That instead of the various short collects there may be one methodical and entire form of prayer composed out of many of them.

(19) That the present Liturgy seems very defective, in that there is no preparatory prayer in our address to God for assistance and acceptance;

taught to believe, that the body of Christ remaineth in the Sacrament as long as the accidents of the bread remain there without corruption.

(23) Or that a mouse or any other worm or beast may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught).

(24) Or that when Christ said, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, this word *hoc* pointeth not to the bread but *individuum vagum*, as some of them say.

(25) Or that these accidents, or forms, or shews of bread and wine, be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself.

(26) Or that the Sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it.

(27) Or that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience——if any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, doctors or councils, as I have required—as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him, and to subscribe.

(20) And in that the Confession does not clearly express original sin, nor sufficiently enumerate actual sins with their aggravations;

(21) And in such forms of publick praise and thanksgiving as are suitable to gospel worship.

(22) Also that the Catechism is defective as to many necessary doctrines of our religion, nor is the Creed as explicit as it ought to be in a Catechism.

(23) That the ministry be not required to wear a surpless in celebrating publick worship.

(24) That the transient image of the cross be not required in baptism.

(25) That the practice of kneeling in the act of receiving the Lord's Supper, be not imposed.

These things themselves, that are desired to be removed, not being of the foundation of religion, nor the essentials of public worship, nor the removal of them any way tending to the prejudice of the church or state; therefore their continuance and rigorous imposition can no ways be able to countervail the laying aside of so many pious and able ministers, and the inconceivable grief that will arise to multitudes of his Majesty's most loyal and peaceable subjects, who upon all occasions are ready to serve him with their prayers, estates and lives.

We invite attention to the contrast which these papers make in regard to the weight or seriousness of the subjects which they respectively present for controversy; and to the candid *confession* of the Puritans *of that day*, that the things which they agitated were not "of the foundation of religion nor the essentials of public worship," over against the *fact* that the things which the Reformers agitated, *were every one of them*, among "the foundations of religion and the essentials of public worship."

Respecting the Holy Scriptures; the Reformers found these in an unknown tongue and withholden from the people. They translated them into the common language, and caused them to be read in the common service of the Church, and to be multiplied for private use.

The Puritans proposed respecting the Holy Scriptures—behold the contrast—that one translation be used rather than another.

The Reformers found the Lord's Supper changed into an object of idolatry, and the Cup kept from the laity. They restored the simple breaking of Bread and distribution of the Cup. The alteration respecting the Lord's Supper which the Puritans proposed, and which they agitated for a generation, pertained to the posture of the individual in receiving it. They simply desired *not to kneel.*

Respecting Prayer, the Reformers found this service in an unknown tongue, and embracing manifold superstitions. They eliminated the supplications to the Saints and the Virgin, and changed the language to that of the people, so that instead of listening to innumerable words in a dark speech, believers heard their very spiritual desires in the words of common life. The Puritans' demand respecting Prayer, was that the Collect and the Litany be made into some continuous form of addresses to God, unbroken by responses or separation of distinct petitions. This is all. They found no superstition or indistinct language to be removed—but simply *wanted the words put in a different order.*

We propose not to follow this contrast, in detail, but simply in this brief beginning to discover its proportions, and suggest to those not familiar with it the reward of a full study. For it is the same throughout. Superstitious ignorance, idolatry, bondage, extortion, tyranny, were removed by the Reformers, while the Puritans would change some words—their form, or order—omit some sign or ceremony—and alter something external. The chief burdens of Popery named in Bishop Jewell's Challenge, were Papal tyranny, ignorance of Scripture, and false doctrine. The chief burdens which troubled the Puritans were, the use of the surplice, the practice of kneeling to receive the bread and wine, and the sign of the cross in baptism.

We are aware that these papers do not contain the full principles of the Reformers, and the Puritans. Bishop Jewell professes

not to be giving an entire synopsis of the doctrines and practices which distinguish the Church of England from Rome—but only those which were then more especially in dispute.

And the schedule of the Puritans which we present was doubtless shaped more by what they thought it probable they could obtain, than by what they would like. Certain it is that Puritanism came to differ from the Church in more points than those suggested. Still, when the work of the Reformation is compared with the work of the Puritans, we think the two will stand in contrast nearly as the two papers which have been noticed. In stating more completely the changes which the Reformers wrought in the Church, we begin with the first, and in some respects, most important change of all—the abolition of the Pope's Supremacy. There existed first the belief in this supremacy; and then the fact of its existence—the very rule of the Pope which seemed a firmly established tyranny over the Church. We shall be able to appreciate the intolerable burden only by attending to some of its workings, or its practical relations as seen in the following specifications of its constituent parts.

I. "A judicial power in matters ecclesiastical or cases of appeal."

II. "A power of granting licenses and dispensations."

III. "A liberty to send legates into England, and to hold legatine Courts."

IV. "A power of granting investiture of Bishops, of Confirming Episcopal elections and of distributing ecclesiastical patronage."

V. "A privilege of receiving first fruits, the tenths of English benefices, and the goods of the clergy who die intestate."

A careful study of the power here implied will reveal that it amounted to a complete despotism over men's souls, bodies and estates,—a perfect inquisition over their faith and conduct. Here was the very bond of all the superstition and corruption which had accumulated in the Roman Church. There seemed no hope for reform with this despotism in force. And we have evidence that the Roman Church lays her chief stress on this article in her creed. She will endure much laxity in other parts if the Pope's Supremacy is acknowledged. In the days of Queen Elizabeth when the Roman Clergy desired to be re-united to the Roman Church, the chief and almost only demand of the Pope was the acknowledgment of his Supremacy.

We dwell thus on this first change accomplished by the Reformation, to show what was the head and front of papal offence; the

bond and security of all other corruptions and superstitions which needed to be removed. This bond must be severed, or the Reformation could not proceed.

The ecclesiastical authorities of the realm discarded the doctrine, and with this preparation and support, the King, Henry the Eighth, cast off the papal power.

The next movement in importance was the Translation of the Holy Scripture in the tongue of the common people, and the reading of the same in the service of the Church.

And then, the Church being delivered from the tyranny of Rome and illuminated with the word of truth, the following changes were accomplished.

The Adoration of relics and the worship of Saints, Angels and the Virgin was abolished.

The Clergy were permitted to marry, and the power of the Monasteries was destroyed.

The doctrine and evil practices of Indulgences, Auricular Confession and Purgatory were disproved and rejected.

In place of the mass, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was restored; private masses were abolished; transubstantiation was denied; the Adoration of the Host was discarded and the Cup was given to the people.

And when these superstitions and errors were eliminated from the Church, the book of Common Prayer was prepared containing a specific denial of these manifold errors, with the prayers and offices of the Church in the language of the people.

One cannot review this catalogue of the changes wrought by the Reformers without being impressed with the serious nature of every one, and how related to the very substance and life of true religion. Nothing seems trifling, nothing small, nothing unworthy the vital struggle and great risks which the prosecution of the work produced. The errors refuted are made so clear that there is no room for suspecting self-opinion in those agitating their removal. The evil practices were so gross that no one thinks of wilfulness or insubmission in those who opposed them. Turning now to the work which the Puritans accomplished or designed, we may express this in a few words.

It was the destruction of the Liturgy and the overthrow of Bishops.

In the above paper we see the changes which they asked to be made in the Liturgy in order to adapt it to their consciences, or ideas of propriety. Underneath these proposals, and in substance contained in them, was the entire abolition of liturgical worship. The request to leave it to the discretion of each Clergyman to omit or use any part of the liturgy was in substance an aim at its very existence.

There was a prejudice which in some minds involved a conscientious objection against those prayers and formularies which had been in use during all the corruptions of the mediæval ages, although they were pure and rich in devotional feeling and expression. And also there was a growing idea of some special influence of the Holy Spirit in extemporaneous worship for which the Liturgy, they thought, furnished no opportunity.

Not all the Puritans, indeed, perhaps not most of them, felt this thorough hostility to the Liturgy, but some made bold expression of it; and it would surely have resulted from the sentiments of others who were more moderate.

And further, although most of the Puritans in the day when the above paper was prepared, believed in some form of Episcopacy, and were not conscious of desires to revolutionize or even destroy the very organization of the Church by removing all Bishops from power and giving place to Presbyterianism or Independency, it proved in the end that this radical issue was virtually contained in the movement they were making. This result was an inference from Puritan principles if not consciously aimed at. To the Brownists, and others who would not willingly acknowledge the name, the hierarchy of the English Church was as offensive as Popery itself. Many, who, in the circumstances, advocated the Episcopal form of government, believed it would and should in due time give way to the order now established in Geneva. It was an essential part of the Puritan spirit to import the extreme doctrines and forms of Geneva and Zurich.

We believe then that two brief mottoes were inscribed from the beginning on the banners of the Puritans—AWAY WITH THE LITURGY; AND DOWN WITH THE BISHOPS.

These sentiments are nearly an accurate statement of what they would do, and of what they did accomplish for themselves,

when in Old England the Act of Toleration was passed, and when in New England they were left to their liberty.

Thus we reduce the changes which the Puritans sought simply to an alteration in the mode of worship and the kind of church government. It was a question about forms in which they struggled, and for which they disturbed the peace of England.

In drawing this limit to the work of the Puritans we are not ignorant of some most serious results which were indirectly connected with it. Being the weaker party in the contest they became the subjects of oppression from ecclesiastical and civil powers, and the tyranny which their insubordination provoked assumed such proportions as at length caused the nation to rise and proclaim some new principles of liberty and constitutional government. And there are not wanting partial or superficial historians who give to the Puritans the full credit of that progress in civil and religious liberty which has been made since the beginning of their movement.

We have then in making out what was distinctively Puritan to draw a line between what was definitely intended, and what was simply contemporaneous or indirectly connected.

The little honor resulting from making a great strife about small matters has naturally been a motive for such explanations or exhibitions of the Puritan aims and work as would magnify their importance.

In order therefore to confirm our statement of what was distinctively Puritan, we need to notice some unfounded assumptions or pretensions.

The Puritans were not distinguished from other professedly good men in *exalting the individual conscience* as the guide of conduct. Good Churchmen are as tenacious as devout Puritans in doing what their consciences dictate.

But there is this difference between the two. The Churchman considers the Church and his spiritual officers as God's appointed guides of conscience, while the Puritan seeks his guide in experiences and peculiar emotions as he himself may interpret them.

But the conscience instructed by authorized teachers is just as truly an *individual* conscience as the one which looks chiefly to

some special emotions. The difference is not that one more than the other exalts conscience, but lies in the way of disciplining conscience. One other peculiarity respecting conscience may be said to mark the Puritans—not all indeed, but many—which is, an excessive scrupulosity, or what the apostle would call weakness. The making so much of a garment, or posture, or sign, tends to exalt unessential things as if they were of chief importance. There is a frailty of conscience of this kind which doubtless is found oftener among Puritans than among Churchmen. Nor were the Puritans singular in exalting the Holy Scriptures as the highest authority in the revelation of God's will. Because the Churchman makes distinctive use of the doings and sayings of the early Fathers in the Church as helps in understanding the Scriptures, as they were nearest the time of the events and customs in question, therefore it is charged upon him that he puts the Fathers in place of Scripture. But the history of the Reformation shows beyond doubt that the Reformers were guided in their work at all times by the Divine Oracles. Indeed we need only to quote the Article of the Church in this matter to prove that no person could exalt the Word of God above the place it holds in the Church for reverence and full confidence.

Article VI. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

No words could more emphatically deny that the Church ever substitutes any human words of fathers or councils for the Holy Scriptures.

Nor was it a peculiarity of the Puritans that they sought to bring the soul directly to God, while the Church placed between the ministry and sacraments. Here again is the confusion made by not distinguishing a necessary means from the end sought. The Church does indeed hold that, ordinarily, her ministry and her sacraments are God's appointed instrumentality for leading men to His presence, but would call it idolatry to substitute these for Himself. And, too, the Church looks with unbelief on that system which proposes to bring the soul into union with God without the aid of any objective instrumentality, leaving it to its own gropings and hungerings, because she has observed that those thus

left to so called self-guidance usually err in seeking God in some emotions which they cannot command, and so they often slumber in darkness long seasons when, with proper help, they might have been rejoicing in peace, and hope, and truth.

Nor was it a peculiarity of the Puritan that he sought to make *spiritual* the worship of God. The very office which he would destroy was devised with the single intent of aiding the spiritual worship of believers. No communion more than this liturgical Church exalts the teaching of Jesus, that "they who worship God must worship in spirit and in truth."

And it is mere presumption to hold as an axiom, that the spiritual part in worship is in inverse proportion to the form employed, else is Quakerism the true mode of worship.

Nor were the Puritans alone in that they sought *to restore the primitive order* in church worship and government. No one purpose was oftener professed by the Reformers than the re-establishment of the Apostolic Order; and no one claim is now oftener made by the Church which they reformed, than that they succeeded in the restoration of Apostolic Catholicity. The difference here is simply one of judgment as to what was the primitive pattern.

Archbishop Cranmer, in his memorable appeal in 1556, after the sentence of degradation had been passed upon him, and he was standing on the brink of death, said:

"Touching my doctrine, of whatsoever kind it be, I protest that it was ever my mind purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I had learned from the Holy Scriptures, and of the holy catholic Church of Christ *from the beginning.*"

Whether or not the English Church be patterned after the Apostolic Order, no communion more than she has been animated with single purpose to find and to imitate it.

Nor did the Puritans embrace in their plans the *severance of Church and State.* They had not attained to this modern idea of the division of ecclesiastical matters from the civil power, and cannot justly be credited with agitating this reform.

In testimony of this statement we quote the following:

* "As for Calvin and the disciplinarians, or puritans, as they are called, they subscribe all the confessions for magistracy and take the same oaths of allegiance and supremacy as others do, and they plead and write for them, so that for my part I know not of any difference in doctrine."

* Baxter's Works, vol. i. p. 764.

* "But Calvin neither liked a pope-king nor a king-pope. Nor do we approve of that in the king which we detest in the pope. But he with us and we with him do judge that King James hath as much to do in the Christian Church as Josias had in the Jewish Church, and we go not about to get any more."

See further the principles of the Puritans in the compact on the Mayflower, where, in all the freedom which they gained by their exile, they recognise their spiritual privileges and liberties, not as theirs by *personal right*, but "by the grace of the king."

Also we may refer to the very practice of the Puritans in New England for generations, in enforcing religious and church duties by the power of the magistrate.

Nor were the Puritans actuated in their work with the desire to establish *Religious Toleration*. They had not attained to this idea of modern society, and are falsely credited with being martyrs to this principle. In testimony to the truth of this declaration we may look to all their conferences, disputations and proposals with the Church of England and find not one single demand for any such liberty. They even opposed it when it was not proposed by others. In the Parliament where the power was with them they refused to give toleration lest thereby Popery might again gain power in the realm. In the Conference at Savoy, a proposal was made for toleration of all kinds of religious faith, and Baxter definitely opposed it. We find no statement of this principle in the formation of the first Church by the Separatists, nor in the compact on the Mayflower, nor in the early faith or practice of the New England exiles.

The toleration for which the Puritans sought was simply toleration for themselves, so long as the power of Church and State was against them. But while they believed that the civil power should not molest themselves they ever sanctioned its opposition to Popery —and when under the reign of Cromwell they gained the control of Church and State, they were no more tolerant of the faith and practice of Churchmen than had the Church, in the past, been of themselves. They enacted a law of conformity which forbade the

* Bishop Andrews.

use of the Book of Common Prayer, and enforced the Directory with such rigor as resulted in the ejection from their livings of thousands of the Clergy of the English Church.

We refer to this not to blame them—for they were only dealing with others as they had been themselves treated, and according to the principles of government then in vogue. They are not to be censured for the twilight of freedom which then prevailed—nor are they to be credited with believing, and seeking to establish a principle which so uniformly they opposed.

And now we are ready to repeat our definition of the work of the Puritans. We find its length and breadth in the two mottoes—AWAY WITH THE LITURGY, and DOWN WITH THE BISHOPS. Whatever worth might be in this change, they were seeking it, and no more—whatever reform might result from these theories they would accomplish, and no more.

To help memory, and to enforce the contrast, we will tabulate the distinctive part in the works and aims of the two parties which we notice.

The Reformers succeeded in abolishing from the Church the following errors and evil practices;

The Papal Supremacy; the Withholding the Holy Scriptures from the people; Celibacy of the Clergy; Transubstantiation; the Mass; the Adoration of the Host; Withholding the Cup from the Laity; Indulgences; Auricular Confession; Adoration of Relics and Images; the Five Additional Sacraments; Purgatory; Supplication of Saints; the Infallibility of Popes and particular Churches.

We see from this historical review, that the work of reforming the Church of England from the errors of Rome was accomplished according to Church-principles. We mean by Church-principles what the language now signifies in contradistinction from Puritan principles. These terms indicate two different methods of religious working. In comparing the two, it is no small testimony in favor of the Church-method to say that it was the one employed, and with success, in recovering from the darkness and evils of Roman power. To say the least, such testimony proves this system to have some worth, and it becomes competing theories and practices in religious affairs to be somewhat modest concerning their superiority, until they have proved by their works, equal efficiency.

But the more special bearing of this statement is in distinguishing two movements in the religious history of England—that of the Reformers and that of the Puritans. Here is the dividing line. The Puritan movement was something subsequent and entirely distinct from the Reformation. The Puritan in his character and operation did not work with the Reformers, nor did he follow them in the same course. He attempted a different mission.

The errors of Rome, which we have specifically noticed, were attacked in the legal, sober method of condemnation and rejection by the acts of Convocation and Parliament. And as much as we now value the separation of the Church from the State, it is quite apparent that the centralized and despotic power of Rome could not have been successfully opposed except by the civil arm. Some are apt to think chiefly of the disadvantages which result from the union of Church and State, because of the oppression it worked upon true Protestants, forgetting that the laws of conformity which bore hard on these, were absolutely necessary in the removal of Popery. The influence for the Protestant cause from the two Formularies of Doctrine, "The necessary Doctrine and Erudition" and "The Institution of a Christian Man," set forth by the convocation and enforced by the civil power, together with the Book of Common Prayer, will probably never be appreciated in this day of religious liberty, and individualism. We are apt to forget that a system of inspection and supervision which now would seem contrary to religious freedom, was absolutely needful in the contest with a power which was using these same instrumentalities with great rigor. We believe that the educational power of a Protestant Liturgy and the supervision of Protestant Bishops were absolutely essential in the work of the Reformation, so that not only did this instrumentality succeed, but the substitute proposed by the Puritans would have failed—and had it been admitted soon after the Reformation was accomplished, it would have resulted in the return of papal error. But whatever the worth of these conclusions, this much is apparent, that not to the Puritans but to the Reformers are we indebted for the work of delivering the Church from the errors of Rome.

Another lesson from this historical review is, that the Reformation was *completed* by the English Church, and not as some assert by the subsequent movement of the Puritans. There are not

wanting the opinions of favorite historians that England is greatly indebted to the Puritans for her Protestantism. It is indeed common teaching in the schools of dissenters, that the Reformation in England was only partial, and the work of the Puritan was to attempt its completion. Now we refer any student to the different errors of Rome, in the overthrow of which the Reformation consisted, and ask which one of them was not rejected by the Church of England decisively and finally in the reign of Queen Elizabeth? Not a single mediæval doctrine or practice was left uncondemned.

We appeal to the Articles of her Faith, and with great confidence challenge any person to present a more complete anti-papal protest. We compare these Articles with any from the continental Reformers, and in no instance do we find a more entire renunciation of Romish corruptions. They are decidedly more Protestant than the Augsburg Confession, and no creed of any dissenting body be it Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregational, or Methodist, will compare in specific statement and denial of papal errors. And this silence in these confessions is direct evidence of an assumption that the abominations of Rome had already been removed.

Our final lesson is, that the Anglican Church, consisting of the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, is the most distinctively Protestant Church in existtence. What other body save our own has the term Protestant incorporated in its name? What other communion has such a catalogue of exiles and martyrs for Protestant truth? What other can present a declaration with the errors of Rome so specifically stated and rejected as in the Thirty-Nine Articles? What other body of divines has enriched the Church with such volumes of anti-Roman literature? And further what Church from the time of the Reformation onward to the present, has been so continually on the alert to watch against the aggression of Rome; and what other Church to-day is more awake in canvassing and refuting her claims than the Anglican Church, in each branch which we have named?

And if we refer to the testimony of martyrs to Protestant truth, the simple statement is, that, in the English race, all of these have their names recorded in the Church of England. The dissenting bodies have never suffered unto blood striving against Rome.

And now we ask, what stronger proof can be brought for the

anti-Roman character of the Anglican Church? She presents a profession of her opposition more complete than any other in the English tongue; and then in favor of the sincerity of her profession points to her extensive literature pertaining to the questions in dispute, convincing in its arguments and learning; then to the industry, the patient toiling and self-sacrificing spirit of her more common efforts; and finally to her worthy children who suffered exile and martyrdom.

We read in Scripture, "Greater love hath no man than this," "that a man will lay down his life for his friends." We may then conclude that the Anglican Church presents not only incomparably greater evidence for the depth and sincerity of her anti-Roman convictions than any other religious body, but also a kind of evidence which cannot be transcended. Having suffered unto blood striving against Rome, she may rest satisfied with her record midst all the false charges and suspicions which would impugn her character. And yet so admirably has she preserved the integrity of truth that while truly Protestant, she is, in her Faith and Order, wholly and essentially CATHOLIC.

BOOK NOTICES.

SERMONS PREACHED AT BRIGHTON BY THE LATE REV. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, THE INCUMBENT OF TRINITY CHAPEL. *New edition. New York, Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square,* 1870.

Rationalism in the Church of England must ever be an exotic. Every page of her Prayer-Book marks its foreign growth, nor in this age of individualism is any form of error more insidious or dangerous than that which denies to the Scripture its inspiration and to the Church her authority. The principle of rationalistic interpretation would sweep away every supernatural element of the Divine Word, and leave nothing but a bare moral system. Concede that the account of the creation is a myth, and the life of Moses is a myth, the career of Jesus is a myth, and the whole plan of salvation through the atonement of the cross is a myth. If Satan is not a personality neither is Christ a personality. It need not, therefore, be a marvel that the entire process of the destructive criticism of Rationalism is regarded with suspicion, even when applied to matters seemingly insignificant, since any admission of its claims logically destroys all that is dearest to the Christian heart.

Could anything seduce us from the orthodox faith it would be the piety and genius of Robertson. His life was stainless. His pulpit ability was

remarkable. His power over the masses was magnetic. His humility was beautiful. His zeal was glowing. A certain fascination spreads itself over his entire career. There is a sparkle in his style whose brilliance dazzles the thoughtless into a belief of his errors, while the mysticism of his piety deludes sincere souls. Yet, after all, we aver that he is radically unsound in the great central truth of the Gospel. He loses sight of law and penalty and atonement. Is Creation merely love? Is Providence merely discipline? Is the Cross merely sympathy? Surely the suffering of this earth through generations proclaims to human consciousness the guiltiness of sin. In all the sacrificial system of the Old Testament *propitiation* is the characteristic conception. Blood flows from the victim. Blood marks the priest. Blood stains the altar. Everything in the tent of the patriarch, the tabernacle of Moses, and the temple of Solomon points to the sacrifice of the Cross. Even in heaven itself the *atoning Lamb* is the central object of worship. No where can penitence find rest from the burden of guilt but in the propitiation of our Divine Lord. To this great fact the Scriptures and the Church unite their testimony. Nor is the anger of the Father appeased by the death of His Son, the bloody vengeance depicted in the caricatures drawn by Mr. Robertson in the style of Universalist and Unitarian declaimers. It contains no element of human weakness. It is not a passion. It is a necessity. It is a sorrow. It is majestic Justice demanding its penalty to save the moral Universe from wreck, and preserve the very throne of the Almighty Sovereign. Nor do the Scriptures give us only terrible pictures of inexorable law. Love in the Godhead is the foundation of salvation. Love moves the Father in consenting to the sacrifice. Love moves the Son to endure the suffering. Love moves the Spirit to influence the sinner. The glory of the orthodox view is that mercy and justice are united by the Cross in their eternal harmony. In the scheme of Mr. Robertson the atonement only reconciles man to God, and *never* God to man. The creature, not the Creator, is to be propitiated. Violated law is nothing; to win the guilty is everything. In the Scriptural plan justice is satisfied before mercy can be exercised. This inversion of God's order taints and weakens all the discourses of our author, so that he makes repentance rather a sentiment than a duty; the suffering of the Cross not a propitiation for guilt, but a motive to holiness; and our Lord Jesus Christ a sympathizer instead of a *Saviour*. Such teaching in the Church of England is startling, and confronted by Lesson, Litany, Collect, Epistle, Gospel, Article, and Communion Office; and the preacher who dares pervert her pulpit to rationalistic error must be haunted by spectres from every part of his misunderstood and mutilated Prayer-Book, until his conscience grows either tortured or insensible, and his whole life becomes a painful discord. To prove how entirely Mr. Robertson discards the atonement as a satisfaction to Divine Justice, we will quote his own statement, where the conception is wholly omitted. He says the reconciliation it produces is fourfold:

"In the first place, Christ hath reconciled man to God. In the second place, He hath reconciled man to man; in the third place, He hath reconciled man to himself; and in the fourth place, He hath reconciled man to duty."

In combating the orthodox view of the atonement, to show how Mr. Robertson perverts truth, and then fights a phantom of blood conjured by his own fancy, we will give his own words. He says:

"I do not deny that this aspect has been given to the sacrifice of Christ. It has been represented as if the majesty of law demanded a victim, and so, as it glutted its insatiate thirst, one victim would do as well as another—the purer and more innocent the better. It has been exhibited as if Eternal Love resolved in fury to strike, and so He had His blow it mattered not whether it fell on the whole world, or on the precious head of His own Son. It represents Him in terms which better describe the ungoverned rage of Saul, missing his stroke at David, who has offended, and in disappointed fury dealing his javelin at his own son Joshua.—It is the feeling of the Siberian story; the innocent has glutted the wolves, and we may pursue our journey in safety. Christ has suffered, I am safe; He bore the agony—I take the reward. I may now live with impunity."

Surely Mr. Robertson never found in the sober and learned pages of any Anglican Divine such a miserable distortion of the truth, and what he has discovered elsewhere furnishes no apology for abandoning that doctrine of propitiation which is the centre of the Gospel, and continually taught by the Church in all ages. We have no time to show how his partial statements dissolve every obligation to the observance of a seventh day as holy to the Lord, and would eventually overturn the very foundations of Christian society. Like many brilliant writers of the Unitarian school he ignores, or distorts the arguments of his adversary, and presents his own with a startling force and in a popular style which dazzle and mislead the thoughtless.

After such severity of criticism we are glad to conclude our notice with an extract from a sermon entitled "Jacob's Wrestling," and which evinces at once great beauty of expression and great fervor of piety.

"There is a sense in which darkness has more of God than light has. He dwells in thick darkness. Moments of tender, vague mystery often bring distinctly the feeling of His presence. When day breaks, and distinctness comes, the Divine has evaporated from the soul like morning dew. In sorrow, haunted by uncertain presentiments, we feel the Infinite around us. The gloom disperses, the world's joy comes again, and it seems as if God were gone—the Being who had touched us with a withering hand, and wrestled with us, yet whose presence, even when most terrible, was more blessed than His absence. It is true, even literally, that the darkness reveals God. Every morning draws the curtain of the garish light across His eternity, and we lose the Infinite. Yes! in solitary, silent, vague darkness the Awful One is near."

APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, ACTS, AND REVELATIONS. *Translated by* ALEXANDER WALKER, ESQ., *one of her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools for Scotland. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark,* 38 *George street, MDCCCLXX. New York, Scribner, Welford & Co., No.* 654 *Broadway.*

Nothing in human nature is more anomalous than the forgeries perpetrated under the name of religion, and with a seemingly pious motive. How could a pure love invent a palpable falsehood? How could a Christian conscience be deluded into a lie? How could disciples of the truth seek aid to their cause by glaring fabrications? Yet these Apocryphal fictions could scarcely be the work of enemies. Whatever our theories to ac-

count for the whole collection, or for any particular book, we find that falsehood possesses one advantage. It makes truth brighter by the contrast. The puerility, the absurdity, the nonsense of mere human inventions increase our reverence for the simplicity, the purity, the majesty of those narrations which breathe a Divine inspiration. Especially with this view should the Apocrypha be carefully studied. We have in the volume before us—translated with a close adherence to the original—THE PROTOEVANGELIUM OF JAMES: THE GOSPEL OF PSEUDO-MATTHEW; THE GOSPEL OF THE NATIVITY OF MARY; THE HISTORY OF JOSEPH THE CARPENTER; THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS; THE ARABIC GOSPEL OF THE INFANCY OF THE SAVIOUR; THE GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS; THE LETTER OF PONTIUS PILATE WHICH HE WROTE TO THE ROMAN EMPEROR CONCERNING OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST; THE REPORT OF PILATE THE PROCURATOR CONCERNING OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST; THE GIVING UP OF PILATE; THE DEATH OF PILATE: THE NARRATIVE OF JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA; THE AVENGING OF THE SAVIOUR, with the APOCRYPHAL ACTS AND REVELATIONS.

THE ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY; TRANSLATIONS OF THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS DOWN TO A. D. 325. *Edited by the* REV. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D. D., *and* JAMES DONALDSON, LL. D., VOL. XV. THE WRITINGS OF TERTULLIAN, VOL. II. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. New York, Messrs. Scribner, Welford & Co., 654 Broadway.

Perhaps no translations in this most admirable and valuable series will be more useful than those from the writings of Tertullian. No ancient Father surpassed him in learning or genius. His wit was sharp, versatile, penetrating. His eloquence often flowed like a tide of fire. His argumentation was as powerful as his erudition was vast. Perhaps it was his African nature, blazing like the sun under which he was born, which at last hurried into heresy this flaming defender of the truth. We might have supposed his training as an advocate would have prevented the foe of Marcion from becoming the champion of Montanus. Usually, no study like the law so cultivates common sense and dispels vague theological dreams. Possibly the eager pursuit of a false and dazzling rhetoric and the cultivation of a splendid style assisted in seducing Tertullian from the simplicity of truth. It would certainly prove a signal benefit in the study of his writings if we could trace the progressive steps of his mental and doctrinal history. Yet, however we may fail in an accurate comprehension of his character and works, the volume before us will always remain a monument of his learning and eloquence. How the man who wrote the following passage became the defender of the monstrous delusions of Montanism must ever be an inexplicable spiritual phenomenon.

"Fever, as being an evil both in its cause and in its power, as all know, we rather loathe than wonder at, and to the best of our power guard against, we having its extirpation in our power. Heresies, however, which bring with them eternal death and the heat of a stronger fire, some men prefer wondering at for possessing this power, instead of avoiding their power when they have the means of escape. But heresies would have no power if men would cease to wonder that they have such power. But it either

happens that while men wonder they fall into a snare, or because they are ensnared, they cherish their surprise, as if heresies were so powerful because of some truth which belonged to them. It would no doubt be a wonderful thing that evil should have every force of its own, were it not that heresies are in those men who are not strong in faith. In a combat of boxers and gladiators, generally speaking, it is not because a man is strong he gains the victory, or loses it because he is not strong, but because he who is vanquished is a man of no strength, and, indeed, this very conqueror, when afterwards matched against a really powerful man, actually retires crestfallen from the contest. In precisely the same way heresies derive such strength as they have from the infirmities of individuals, having no strength when they encounter a really powerful faith."

Perhaps in this very remarkable extract there is a lurking self-consciousness and exultation, whose seed, nurtured through silent years, finally flowered into a mournful heresy. The pride of splendid genius too often prepares its own overthrow. It is the brightest sun which engenders the most poisonous exhalations.

A TREATISE ON THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MARRIAGE. *By* HUGH DAVEY EVANS, LL. D., *with a Biographical Sketch of the author, and an Appendix containing* "BISHOP ANDREWES' DISCOURSE ON SECOND MARRIAGE," ETC., *now printed for the first time in this country.* New York. Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge, Riverside Press, 1870.

In the East and in the West are two systems founded on lust and superstition. They are simply vast, powerful, organized adulteries, defiant towards God and ruinous towards man. But the corruptions in which they exist are natural to every human heart. Both find their defence in perverted views of the Scripture, in which they have been virtually supported by a long line of learned and pious Divines, Roman and Protestant. If God permitted polygamy in Abraham, Jacob, David, and Solomon it is hard to believe the practice intrinsically sinful, and Mohammed and Brigham Young have at least a strong apology for their lusts. Much of the criminal laxity of modern society, modern legislation, and modern jurisprudence has unquestionably arisen from the indulgence supposed to have been allowed in the Old Testament to the strength of human passions. The time has, therefore, arrived when the true doctrine of marriage should be asserted and explained. The proceedings of our American Courts are disgraceful to civilization and destructive to society, and the evils they have caused seemed to have oppressed the heart of the pious and learned Evans. In most respects few men were better qualified to grasp the subject discussed in the volume to which he devoted almost the last moments of his life. He was singularly patient, pure, and humble. He had the rare faculty of forgetting himself in his subject. He sought simple truth. His "Christian Doctrine of Marriage" is an exhaustive treatise, equally remarkable for philosophical acumen and Scriptural argument. Its style has all the purity of the author's head and heart. Occasionally we observe a repetition, perhaps traceable to extreme age, but usually the reasoning is clear, manly, and conclusive. We differ from the author in his opinion touching the right of both parties to a divorce for adultery to marry, and honor our General Convention for its in-

dependence in framing a canon which departed from the views of a man so learned, wise, and venerable.

OPINIONS CONCERNING THE BIBLE LAW OF MARRIAGE. BY ONE OF THE PEOPLE. Philadelphia, Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, Nos. 819 and 821 Market street. 1871.

We are sorry that the author of so excellent a book has seen fit to conceal his name. The public have a right to all the weight of influence attaching to a writer who has devoted to a subject so vital such investigation and ability. The work is especially valuable for the earnestness and power with which it seeks to defend the Old Testament from the imputation of fostering lust by permitting polygamy. We have never seen the argument in a form more conclusive and convincing. All Christians should hail with joy efforts so sincere, zealous, and successful to place the law of marriage on its true and enduring foundation, where it is alike supported by Creation, Revelation, and Providence.

THE EARLY YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY. BY E. D. PRESSENSÉ, D. D., *Author of "Jesus Christ; His Times, Life, and Work." Translated by* ANNIE HARWOOD. THE APOSTOLIC ERA. New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1870.

Dr. Pressensé seems to aim in his works to attain the fascination of Renan, and accomplish for the truth by glitter of style what the brilliant apostate achieves for error. If the contest between these writers related merely to the doctrine the advantage would be with the Divine, but when it becomes a rivalry of genius the skeptic has the superiority. The terseness, the vivacity, the flash of Renan spring from his native peculiarities of mind, and are not to be imitated. In Pressensé you perceive a labored, and disappointing effort to gain what is utterly beyond his power. This volume describing the Primitive Church displays cleverness of style, but exhibits little brilliance, and no power. It is meagre in learning, superficial in argument, and unsound in doctrine. The author often disposes of great questions demanding long and patient investigation, in short, condensed, oracular sentences which are always offensive, since they leave the impression that from the opinion expressed there can be no possible appeal. This book wholly fails to sustain the previous reputation of Dr. Pressensé. Its teachings in regard to Baptism and the Sabbath will awaken the suspicions of all orthodox Christians, and its views of Church Order excite distrust by their errors, and contempt by their shallowness. We will conclude our notice with some of the almost unsupported dicta of our author, which will clearly exhibit his principles. He says in his chapter on the constitution of the Church in the first century:

"Each of the Churches is a small republic, a society of believers, an association of Christians which governs itself without seeking direction or inspiration from any of its sister Churches. The entire Church is supposed to be assembled with the apostle as a council of discipline, under the invisible Presidency of our Lord Jesus Christ. No dis-

tinction is made; all the believers are called together to pronounce, as a sovereign tribunal, the sentence of condemnation. The sacraments are equally far from being a monopoly of the clergy. In a word, therefore, ecclesiastical offices did not constitute in this second period, any more than in the first, a new order of priesthood. They were not directly and authoritatively instituted by God, but were created one by one as the necessity arose for them in the Church."

Yet, afterwards, most strangely and inconsistently, it is asserted that while they have no divine authority, they yet proceeded from divine inspiration. We can scarcely imagine that more looseness, vagueness—we dislike to say ignorance—could be condensed in a single chapter.

SELF-HELP; WITH ILLUSTRATIONS OF CHARACTER, CONDUCT, AND PERSEVERANCE. BY SAMUEL SMILES, *Author of the "Life of George Stephenson and of His Son, Robert Stephenson," "The Huguenots," Etc.* New York. Harper & Brothers. 1870.

In our age every man is, in a peculiar sense, thrown on his own resources. How many individuals and families in America having ancestral wealth and position, who, owing to an excessive refinement and culture, shrink from contact with these rough times, and fall speedily into obscurity and decay; Before many years in Europe, when establishments are dissolved, and primogenitures are abolished, and monarchies are modified, self-resource will be more than ever necessary. The biographer of the "Stephensons" and the author of the "Huguenots" is admirably qualified to cultivate that manly independence which will be more and more desirable as society advances. His mind is practical; his style is clear and forcible; his store of facts and illustrations is boundless. The very origin of this volume is a presumption in favor of its usefulness. The author prepared its materials for lectures intended to instruct illiterate workmen, and furnish them with incentives and principles to assist them in the stern battles of life. We are not surprised that his efforts bore fruit. Scholars as well as mechanics may derive benefit from this result of his sagacity and industry, and especially should our American youth study this volume significantly styled "Self-Help." We commend to them especially a single extract:

"The power of money is, on the whole, overestimated. The greatest things which have been done for the world have not been accomplished by rich men, or by subscription-lists, but by men generally of small pecuniary means. Christianity was propagated over half the world by men of the poorest class, and the greatest thinkers, discoverers, inventors, and artists have been men of moderate wealth, many of them little raised above the condition of manual laborers in point of worldly circumstances. The youth who inherits wealth is apt to have life made too easy for him, and he soon grows sated with it because he has nothing else to desire. Having no special object to struggle for he finds time hangs heavy on his hands; he remains morally and spiritually asleep, and his position in society is often no higher than that of a polypus over which the tide floats."

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR. BY JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D., *Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York, Author of "A Treatise on Human Physiology," "A History of the*

Intellectual Development of Europe," Etc., etc. In three volumes. Vol. III. Containing the events from the Proclamation of the Emancipation of the Slaves to the end of the War. New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

Dr. Draper is least where he esteems himself greatest, and greatest where he thinks himself least. When he theorizes he is dull, and when he describes he is graphic. He deems his collegiate position demands that he should be a philosopher, and he, therefore, encumbers his history with speculations which have no more connection with his narrative of events than the experiments and instructions of his lecture-room. Having exhausted his theories in former volumes he now emerges from a land of mists into a region of light. This conclusion of his History confines itself chiefly to a record of facts, and will sustain the reputation of the author. Dr. Draper, we think, is often singularly successful in a faithful, graphic and interesting delineation of battles. There is no painful and unnatural intensity in his descriptions, such as often disgusts in the pages of Headley, He grasps strongly the characteristic features of the scene, and with a few vivid words paints his picture plainly for the eye. The entire work is marked by a spirit of manly fairness, and gives evidence of patient research, and will certainly take its rank with the best histories of a war which has not only shaped the future of our own country, but left its impress on the entire world. It demonstrated that the railroad and the telegraph had revolutionized all previous methods, and that the conflicts of nations are hereafter to be remarkable for the vastness of armies, the destructiveness of weapons, and the brevity of the struggle. The present war of Europe passes before the eye like a gigantic panorama painted in blood and unrolled by a steam engine.

CHRIST IN SONG; HYMNS OF IMMANUEL, SELECTED FROM ALL AGES WITH NOTES. BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. New York, Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., No. 770 Broadway, 1870.

The learned compiler has undertaken in this volume a difficult work. First, the title of his book confines him to hymns relating to our Lord, and thus is excluded a large class of compositions celebrating God in Creation and Providence rather than in Redemption. The beautiful lines of Cowper —so simple, so musical, so inspiring, breathing such faith and tenderness— beginning,

"God moves in a mysterious way,"

do not fall within the scheme of the present enterprise. Again, if the compiler selects only the *best* songs of the Church he fills his pages with verses everywhere familiar in Christian families and assemblies; or if he omits hymns made universal by pious genius he must encumber his work by inferior productions dragged from their deserved obscurity. Moreover, the book, by its title, is properly restricted to poetical compositions, written to be *sung*, whereas the very prelude to the volume contradicts the purpose in

dicated, since its length, measure, and character make it practically unsuitable for musical use, either in private or public worship. A similar remark applies to other selections. We cannot say that Dr. Schaff has overcome all the difficulties of his enterprise, but he has accomplished whatever was possible, and the publishers have performed most creditably their part. Among the best things in the volume is the beautiful beginning of the Preface written by its compiler, and expressing admirably his liberal and noble views:

"Christ is the centre of sacred art as well as of theology and religion. The noblest works of the master-painters are attempts to portray His 'human face divine'—now in the charm of childhood, now in the agony of the cross, now in the glory of the resurrection, now in His majesty as Judge of the world. The "Hymns of Jesus" are the Holy of holies in the temple of sacred poetry. From this sanctuary every doubt is banished; here the passions of sense, pride, and unholy ambition give way to the tears of penitence, the joys of faith, the emotions of love, the aspirations of hope, the anticipations of heaven; here the dissensions of rival churches and theological schools are hushed into silence; here the hymnists of ancient, mediæval, and modern times, from every section of Christendom—profound divines, stately Bishops, humble monks, faithful pastors, devout laymen, holy women—unite with one voice in the common adoration of a common Saviour. He is the theme of all ages, tongues, and creeds; the divine harmony of all human discords; the solution of all the dark problems of life."

THE THEOLOGY OF CHRIST FROM HIS OWN WORDS. BY JOSEPH P. THOMPSON. New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Here is a volume inscribed to learned Divines, prepared upon a plan believed to be novel; intended for theological seminaries, and commended to the universal Church. The Preface excited expectations of an erudite and exhaustive treatise. There could scarcely be a wider chasm between a promise and a performance. We should pronounce this book of Dr. Thompson's scarcely fit in style or matter for the pupils of a Bible class, or the audience of a lecture-room. The chapter styled "A Living Providence" is a curiosity in religious literature. Its first three pages have all the sensationalism of an extemporaneous address, and we can imagine that they have been more than once used in some placarded harangue. Indeed, in every part of the volume we have had our suspicions excited that the materials had been furnished from speeches and sermons which had served their purpose on the platform and in the pulpit. We can imagine that Dr. Bacon, as he perused this work of his former pupil, must have frequently lifted his spectacles with an equivocal smile, and we are certain that the students of Andover would scarcely respect it as a text-book.

PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, AND THE SONG OF SOLOMON, WITH NOTES, CRITICAL EXPLANATORY, AND PRACTICAL. DESIGNED FOR BOTH PASTORS AND PEOPLE. BY REV. HENRY COWLES, D.D.—New York. D. Appleton & Co., 90, 92, 94 Grand St. 1870.

There is scarcely any religious problem more puzzling than the career of Solomon. The child of Wisdom, specially endowed by Heaven, and whose Proverbs will instruct all generations, gives the lie to his own inspired teach-

ings, and becomes a son of folly. He, who so realized the hollowness of earth, the uncertainty of life, and the nearness of death, abandoned himself to chase the phantoms of pleasure. He who celebrated in his youth that human love which is the chosen type of the divine, in his age is ensnared by women, and guilty of the very sin against which his most pointed aphorisms are directed. Above all, he who constructed the Temple to Almighty God, and brought from heaven into its Holiest by his prayers the descending and abiding glory, at last forsakes the worship of Jehovah, and bows before the altars and images of idolatry. It is difficult whether most to wonder at such a defection, or the honesty of the inspired writers who dare its record. Of course a career so marvelous and eccentric as that of Solomon's must originate many difficult critical inquiries. In regard to the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles we have questions of authenticity, and authorship, and text, and interpretation, which require for their solution the utmost candôr, patience, learning, and ability. Much dreamy nonsense has collected around the writings of the wise man which requires to be dissipated. Absurd theories have to be exploded; learned rubbish must be cleared away; rash extremes are to be avoided. Perhaps no author has brought to the execution of such a work more sound judgment than Dr. Cowles. His erudition is not great; but he possesses solid judgment, patient industry, and a sincere love of truth. With such gifts an Ohio minister may accomplish more for healthful and useful criticism than learned German or English professors amid all the literary treasures of vast, antiquated, renowned European libraries, where common sense is too often despised, and mere erudition worshiped. Every man who wishes instruction in regard to the writings of Solomon will find valuable assistance in this excellent book of Dr. Cowles.

THE ROB ROY ON THE JORDAN, NILE, RED SEA, AND GENNESARETH, ETC. A CANOE CRUISE IN PALESTINE AND EGYPT, AND THE WATERS OF DAMASCUS. BY J. MACGREGOR, M. A. *With Maps and Illustrations.* New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

We do not think that Mr. MacGregor has added materially to the stores of human knowledge. We do not arise from the perusal of his book much wiser than when we began. But we have been entertained. The novelty of eating, sleeping, and traveling in an English canoe on the waters of Africa and Asia has its attractions. Besides, the simplicity and earnestness of the explorer give a certain freshness to the volume. If never particularly vivacious or instructive, he is often pleasing and interesting. Once he almost made a discovery, which he relates with amusing gravity. He is on the Kishon; he is at breakfast; he dips a can in the water. Lo, a measured, breathing, gurgling, hissing sound, and near his hand—a crocodile. Yes! a crocodile. He is sure it is a crocodile, and yet not quite certain. Important reflections speedily follow. How invaluable this discovery! The animal knocks below against the "Rob Roy." The shore is hastily reached, and footprints joyfully observed. If traces of the crocodile in the waters of Palestine constitute the chief discovery of our traveler we must not limit the

worth of his book by the insignificance of such an achievement. The novelty of his plan and the boldness of its execution always lend interest to his narrative.

THE LIFE OF MARY RUSSELL MITFORD, AUTHORESS OF "OUR VILLAGE," ETC. *Told by herself in letters to her friends. Edited by the Rev. A. G. K. L'Estrange. In two volumes.* New York. Harper & Brothers. Franklin Square. 1870.

A brief biography embracing the principal events of Miss Mitford's life and written in a vivacious style would have possessed more interest to the general reader than the present collection of her letters. Thoughtful persons, however, will prefer to study the career and character of a genius so brilliant in words poured forth in all the confidence of affection and friendship. These volumes are singularly rich and suggestive. The relations of Miss Mitford to her father invest her entire life with the colors of romance. He was evidently a heartless man of the world—an Apollo in appearance, lavish in expenditure, frank in manner, and with some strange fascination over his gifted daughter. After squandering his wife's estate and a large sum drawn by his little daughter in a lottery, he did not hesitate to stake recklessly at the gaming table money which filial affection earned during years of weary, thankless, exhausting toil. Nothing in literary history is more marvelous, or more interesting, than the heroic devotion of a noble daughter to her unworthy father, who expended on his selfish pleasures the proceeds of so much genius.

The letters which fill these volumes are not only interesting because they unveil the struggles and opinions of a remarkable woman, but also because they bring to our view, in a manner so unconscious and so graphic, many of the distinguished personages of a former generation. After seeing the heroes of the stage strut in their paint and tinsel beneath the glare of brilliant lights, we are sometimes pleased to observe them behind the scenes, in their ordinary tones and manners and attire. Amid all the bright nonsense and rattling gaieties of these letters it is pleasing to remark that Miss Mitford cherished in her heart a sincere faith, which shed its mild glory over her closing life.

HOME INFLUENCE; A TALE FOR MOTHERS AND DAUGHTERS. BY GRACE AGUILAR. *A new edition.* New York. D. Appleton & Co., 90, 92 and 94 Grand St. 1870.

Nothing can be more painful than the delicate sensibilities of genius subjected to the rough experiences of life. That intensity which is necessary to vivid conception and expression brings with it suffering. Thus, the path of an author to success often lies through a region of inevitable pain. Grace Aguilar did not escape the stern ordination, although, in her case, there was no peculiar trial. Her father was devoted. Her mother was affectionate. Her brothers were kind. Her home was surrounded by much that was attractive and beautiful, and her youth breathed an atmosphere of love. Yet, the ordinary sorrows of life exhausted its springs, and her sensi-

tive nature early found repose in the grave. But during her few years of labor she produced much that excites interest and deserves study. "Home Influence." is everywhere bright with marks of genius. Its sweetness, its purity, its refinement contrast strangely with the coarseness, the vulgarity, the masculinity which too often characterize works of women now teeming from the press, to roughen the thoughtless and disgust the cultivated.

THE NEW TIMOTHY. BY WM. M. BAKER, *Author of "Inside," "Oak Mot," The Virginians in Texas," "Life and Labors of Daniel Baker," Etc. etc.* New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers. Franklin Square. 1870.

The aim of this tale is excellent. Perhaps nothing in this country and age is more noticeable than the fact that the young men who issue from our Theological Seminaries, while often furnished with discipline and learning, are seldom remarkable for experience and tact. The associations of the preparing lawyer, even at college, fit him for the world, and his discipline in the office gives him a knowledge not only of the principles of his profession, but of the ways of men. He is not usually a fledgling when he makes his first appearance in Court. The young physician also is placed in a situation where he observes the world before he commences his practice. But even at college, the student who has the ministry in view, is, from that very fact isolated, and in the Theological Seminary he is a mere recluse, buried from common life among men least of all acquainted with its modes and spirit. His sermons are mercilessly criticised until every trace of nature and every gleam of originality have evaporated like the aroma from powdered rose-leaves. He wanders forth *in* the world and not *of* it, and perhaps wastes years in chasing phantoms before he acquires experience. No problem is more perplexing than to maintain our thoroughness and exactitude in theological training, and at the same time educate Clergymen into a manliness which, without sacrificing truth o dignity, shall be in sympathy with the age and country. The author of the "New Timothy" has read the difficulty we have named, and sought in his book to illustrate its solution. His hero is a young minister fresh from the Divinity School, who finds himself suddenly amid the hard, rough, boisterous scenes of border-life in Texas, and whose sense and piety gradually adapt themselves to his situation and conquer practical success. The plan of the novel is well conceived; the characters are drawn with spirit; the style is vivacious, and the interest is usually maintained. Considered as the work of a pastor occupied with the innumerable cares of a family and a parish, the vigor and originality of the tale are remarkable. The dialogue is especially vivacious. However, in the plot there is no culmination; in the characters there is no development, and in the interest there is no increase. Mr. Baker is rather a clever photographer than a creative artist.

FREE RUSSIA. BY WILLIAM HEPWORTH DIXON, *Author of "Free America," "Her Majesty's Tower," Etc., etc.* New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

More than twenty years since we found in an obscure farm-house a won-

derful book called "Fleming's Apocalyptic Key." It modestly professed to give a clew to the tangled mazes of the Revelation, and such was the impression it made that memory after so long an interval can recall its scheme. The volume was written by a Scotch Presbyterian clergyman who settled in London, and was published in the first decade of the eighteenth century. It maintained that the seven seals of the Apocalypse represented seven judgments under the Roman Empire; that the seven trumpets signified seven events which extended the Papal domination; and that the seven vials were seven retributions poured on Satan's kingdom in various parts of the world. It was indicated that the Pope in 1848 would lose his temporal throne, which he was to regain, and be hurled from it soon a second time. Then the domination of Mohammedanism was doomed to speedy overthrow. Bismarck and Gortschakoff seem to have arranged the fulfilment of this programme sketched nearly two centuries since by an humble Scotch preacher, and the present vast war is but a development of their policy. Prussia has already, indirectly, but most effectually, terminated the temporal sway of the Pope, and Russia appears preparing to terminate the European sway of the Turk. It is almost certain that the Cross will supplant the Crescent, and the Muscovite Capital be reflected in the waters of the Golden Horn. The freedom of the serf and reform in the Church have been fitting Russia to fulfill the predestined will of Heaven. Amid such vast movements of the nations as are now changing the map of Europe. everything touching the Empire of the Czar is invested with peculiar interest. Mr. Dixon could not have selected a more popular theme for his book. We could have wished it treated in a more sober and reliable manner. Our author is bright, sprightly, agreeable. You follow him always with pleasure, and often with profit. He seldom flags; he has the dash of a locomotive; but necessarily with its rapidity of movement you are whirled away from the possibility of minute observation. The scene is fascinating as you rush amid objects glancing, dancing, turning, until your eye is bewildered. Your mind has been filled with multiplied images of beauty, and is yet satisfied with none. We rise from the perusal of Mr. Hepworth's book often delighted, but with something of the feeling experienced after a rapid railway ride through a peculiarly interesting region. Much has been hastily seen and little has been truly learned. Readers for amusement will buy "Free Russia," while readers for instruction will procure something more solid and reliable. We may also venture to notice an unpleasant impression made by this volume, and by those produced in a similar way. The question "Will it pay?" is suggested from title-page to conclusion. Amid all the most sacred scenes of nature, and the most striking collections of art, we know the writer is cogitating what he shall sketch to make his picture sell. Whether he converses with a beggar, or is presented to a prince, his powers are ever awake to observe some word, or note some incident which will *take* with the publisher or the public. Sordidness in this age, more than any other poison, is corrupting its literature.

THE AMERICAN ANNUAL CYCLOPÆDIA AND REGISTER OF IMPORTANT EVENTS OF THE YEAR 1869. EMBRACING POLITICAL, CIVIL, MILITARY, AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS, PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, BIOGRAPHY, STATISTICS, COMMERCE, FINANCE, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, AND MECHANICAL INDUSTRY. *Volume IX.* New York. D. Appleton & Co., 90, 92 and 94 Grand St. 1870.

Every annual volume of this admirable work is remarkable for the fullness of its information. We do not think the last inferior to its predecessors. Turn to any particular topic! We select that treating of the Roman Catholic Church, and quote a few paragraphs giving most valuable statistical information:

"There were in December, 1869, 55 Cardinals, of whom 5 were Cardinal Bishops (one See being vacant), 42 Cardinal Priests, and 8 Cardinal Deacons; 39 were Italians by birth, and only 16 non-Italians; 7 French, 4 Spanish, 3 Germans, 1 Portuguese, and 1 Irish. According to the *Annuario Pontificio*, for 1869, there were twelve Patriarchs of the Latin and Oriental rite, 12 Latin Archbishops immediately dependent on the Holy See, 120 with ecclesiastical provinces; 7 Oriental Archbishops; total, 139 Archbishops. Of Latin Bishops, there are 6 called Suburbicarians, always Cardinals with Sees near Rome; 84 immediately subject to the Holy See, and 570 with Dioceses; 66 Bishops of the Oriental rite; total, 723.

BIBLE NOTES FOR DAILY READERS, A COMMENT ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. BY EZRA M. HUNT, A.M., M. D., *Author of "Grace Culture,' Etc.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway.

Perhaps no work requires more profound learning, more consummate judgment, and more patient industry than a popular commentary on the Holy Scriptures. To master the entire field, and then to gather from it only what is important to the general reader presupposes a double gift. It is indeed easier to prepare a treatise for the learned than a commentary for the people. The man is bold who ventures such a task. If candor, zeal, and industry could have ensured success Dr. Hunt's labors would be pronounced triumphant. We cannot affirm that he has succeeded in his vast undertaking, but we do not doubt that his work will prove to many a valuable aid to the study of the Divine Word. It strikes us that the usual plan of giving the Scripture text entire would be far preferable to that adopted. The inconvenience of having two books to examine at once is not compensated by the diminution in the bulk of these volumes. We suggest that the translation of "Genesis" by "*production*," in the second line of the Introduction, does not excite confidence in the accuracy of the author's scholarship.

A COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS. BY JOHN PETER LANGÉ, D. D., *in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated from the German, revised, enlarged, and edited by* PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., *in connection with American scholars of various Evangelical Denominations. Vol. VII. of the New Testament, containing the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1870.

This valuable Commentary seems to unite in itself almost every advantage possible. The theological acquisitions of the original author are rich even for Germany, and his access to libraries enabled him to command the literary wealth of Europe. Dr. Schaff, with much of the erudition of his fatherland, has also the practical sense of his adopted country. The American Divines whom he has summoned to his assistance have extensive and varied qualifications for their laborious work. Perhaps no Commentary concentrates upon itself more which renders it useful in the exposition of the Holy Scriptures to scholars and ministers. Of course, Churchmen regret the absence of principles which they so much cherish, but their liberality is always disposed to acknowledge merit, and their culture will appreciate the achievements of pious learning. We venture to suggest that some statements in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Galatians are unguarded. It is said:

"As implied in the occasion of writing indicated above, the Apostle intended by this, his Epistle, to destroy the influence which the Judaizing teachers, with their legal doctrine, had gained in the Galatian Churches, and to bring anew to general acknowledgment—in the first place, his apostolic authority, and next, on this basis, of the Gospel preached by him, of the sinner's justification through faith, and *of the freedom of the believer from the law.*" Again, "In this he sets himself in complete opposition to the legal tendency itself, or to the opinion *of a necessity of the observance of the law to the attainment of salvation.*"

Surely, such language is liable to serious misconstruction, and may occasion grave practical errors. Obedience to the Law is certainly no ground for a believer's justification, but it is, without question, the rule of a believer's life. 1. The Law carries conviction to the conscience. 2. The Law compels to faith in Christ as the sole instrument of our acceptance. 3. The Law becomes the standard of our duty, according to which we must measure our motives and regulate our actions. After justification, filial love, indeed, supplants servile fear, but releases from no moral obligation. To affirm without qualification that the believer is free from the law, and that its observance is not necessary to salvation, is essential antinomianism. While faith justifies the sinner obedience is essential to the Christian.

AN ENGLISH GREEK LEXICON. BY C. D. YONGE. WITH MANY NEW ARTICLES, AN APPENDIX OF PROPER NAMES, AND PILLON'S GREEK SYNONYMS, TO WHICH IS PREFIXED AN ESSAY ON THE ORDER OF WORDS IN ATTIC GREEK PROSE. BY CHARLES SHORT, LL. D., *Professor of Latin in Columbia College, New York. Edited by* HENRY DRISLER, LL. D., *Professor of Greek in Columbia College, Editor of "Liddell & Scott's Greek-English Lexicon," Etc., etc.* New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

Perhaps no literary work undertaken on the American Continent has demanded such extensive learning as the volume we now propose to notice. The plan and execution of the English original were each excellent. They are thus stated in a brief extract from the Preface of the first edition:

"In the work as it now stands my aim has been to exhibit a complete English vocabulary, so far, at least, as there are words in Greek, by which the English words can be literally or adequately rendered, and where this cannot be done, to supply, wherever practicable, the deficiency by phrases. In every instance I have cited the authority for the word or phrase given, so that the student may see at once whether an expression be poetical, and if so, whether in general use, or confined to Epic Poetry, or to Tragedy, or of a later date and belonging to the era of Theocritus and Apollonius; or whether it be found also in prose, or only in prose, and whether used by the historians, the orators, or the philosophers."

Dr. Drisler, in his own Preface, says:

"The editor has endeavored in the main to carry out the principles of the original work. In his own additions he has given authority for all new words introduced, but he has contented himself with referring to the class of writers generally, when a word was used by a particular class, instead of specifying the individual writers."

The labor and learning expended by the American editor on his great work are most commendable. His judgment equals his scholarship, and both reflect honor on his institution and his country. We sincerely hope his pecuniary reward will correspond to his merit, his zeal, and his reputation.

Dr. Short has contributed to the volume an essay on "The Order of Words in Attic Greek Prose," which we predict will be a standard for reference not probably to be supplanted. Its fullness, clearness, and arrangement have not been surpassed. We have not had time for a minute examination of Mr. Arnold's translation of Pillon, but we are certain that it deserves a place in a volume which almost commences a new era in American scholarship In this age of superficial labor and sensational writing we can scarcely honor too much the pure, solid, conserving influence of the men who thus bury themselves from the popular gaze while examining the very foundations of a language which has so widely moulded the thought and speech and conduct of the human family. How preferable the steady light of their scholarship to the rocket-glare which dazzles the multitude!

LECTURES ON ART DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD IN HILARY TERM. 1870. BY JOHN RUSKIN, M. A. 16mo. pp. 153. London and New York, Macmillan & Co. 1870.

It is a significant change in modern education that John Ruskin, the first of living art critics, should himself be the professor of this new department of study in a University where the attention has so long been given almost exclusively to the classics. This widening of the range of culture is sure to result in the better application of art, as it is a happy thing for the new movement that it is willingly inaugurated by a man of genius, who in his ripest years consents to impart to pupils in Lectures his choicest conclusions on the studies of his life. These Lectures deserve a wider audience than the University, and their prompt publication is both wise and happy. It would be hard to find anywhere so much true and searching criticism as is contained in these seven Lectures. The Place of Art in Education, the Relation of Art to Religion, the Relation of Art to Morals, the Relation of Art

to Use, Line, Light, Color are the subjects, and the course of thought is that which gives a right conception of Art itself.

Mr. Ruskin's treatment is characteristic. With the keenest and truest remarks on the uses of Art, and the uses which it serves, he cannot help running off into moralizings which themselves true and excellent have almost nothing to do with the subject in hand; and yet this almost erratic breadth and fullness gives this little volume a suggestive value which is perhaps Mr. Ruskin's own best contribution to the thought of his time. The most imaginative prose writer in the language, having a style clear, simple, idiomatic, expressive, he imparts to whatever subject he takes up a wonderful freshness and life. The present volume, as giving right conceptions of art, and as showing the connection of all high art with character, is a contribution of the greatest value to literature; and open as very many of its statements are to criticism, and abounding, like all that Mr. Ruskin writes, in a certain fine extravagance, it is yet a work which can be read again and again, and contains more of the statements of the results of very wide study and discursive experience than anything Mr. Ruskin has previously given. He could have only written these Lectures after so many years of study, and they contain the wise conclusions of many years of thought.

MORNING AND EVENING EXERCISES; SELECTED FROM THE PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED WRITINGS OF THE REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER. *Edited by* LYMAN ABBOTT, *Author of "Jesus of Nazareth." "Old Testament Shadows," etc.* New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1871.

This volume exhibits Mr. Beecher in his best aspects. There are in it occasional expressions rash and almost irreverent, but none of those witticisms and vulgarities which too often degrade and profane the Plymouth Pulpit. We do not wonder that such glowing and truthful eloquence as everywhere gushes and brightens through these pages attracts and charms the multitude. Christ is in it a present power to help and heal. God is not here a doctrine, but a presence, filling the Universe, and breathing over the heart and drawing humanity towards heaven. Mr. Beecher's defective teachings in regard to the atonement do not appear. The volume is a treasury of genius, where manly sense and splendid fancy clothe their thoughts and images in words strong and striking and beautiful.

LIGHT AT EVENING TIME; A BOOK OF SUPPORT AND COMFORT FOR THE AGED. *Edited by* JOHN STANFORD HOLME, D. D. New York. Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square. 1871.

When Christian age has withdrawn itself from the cares of active life, and is looking upward calmly with hope toward heaven, it has special privileges for pious meditation. It is pausing between a past of battles in this scene of war and an eternal future of peace, joy, and glory, and is furnished with materials for reflection from two worlds. This volume, properly styled "Light at Evening Time," is compiled for persons who have reached the period of life just described. The selections are from the choicest

Christian writers, living and dead, and seem in all respects adapted to the purpose proposed.

THE CHILDREN'S CRUSADE; AN EPISODE OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY. BY GEORGE ZABRISKIE GRAY. New York. Published by Hurd & Houghton, Cambridge, Riverside Press. 1870.

We are thankful that Mr. Gray has collected with so much patient toil from a variety of sources all that is reliable in regard to one of the most marvellous and most melancholy movements recorded by history. Fact here transcends Fiction. But we will not enter the charmed region. Mr. Gray has told his story sometimes tediously, but usually well, and the publishers have successfully employed their celebrated skill to please the eye and improve the taste of American children.

THE BOTTOM OF THE SEA. BY L. SONREL. *Translated and edited by* ELIHU RICH. New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

WONDERFUL BALLOON ASCENTS; OR, THE CONQUEST OF THE SKIES. A HISTORY OF BALLOONS AND BALLOON VOYAGES. *From the French of* F. MARION, *with illustrations.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

WONDERS OF ACOUSTICS; OR, THE PHENOMENA OF SOUND. *From the French of* RODOLPHE RADAN. *The English revised by* ROBERT BALL, M. A., *with illustrations.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

WONDERS OF BODILY STRENGTH AND SKILL IN ALL AGES AND COUNTRIES. *Translated and enlarged from the French of* GUILLAUME DEPPING *by* CHARLES RUSSELL, *with numerous illustrations.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

We are glad that this admirable series of translations from the French is continued. Nothing could be better adapted to please and instruct our children. Science may not, perhaps should not, expel Fiction from their libraries, but in such forms she will accomplish much in cultivating a healthful taste for knowledge.

MY APINGI KINGDOM; WITH LIFE IN THE GREAT SAHARA AND SKETCHES OF THE CHASE OF THE OSTRICH, HYENA, ETC. BY PAUL DU CHAILLU. *Numerous engravings.* New York. Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square. 1871.

ADVENTURES OF A YOUNG NATURALIST. BY LUCIEN BIART. *Edited and adapted by* PARKER GILLMORE, *with one hundred and seventeen illustrations.* New York. Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square. 1871.

CHRIST, OR THE WORLD! WHICH? BY COUSIN FLORENCE. Baltimore. George Lycett, 44 Lexington street.

CHRISTINE THORNTON; OR, WHO IS MY NEIGHBOR? AN EASTER STORY, *by* E. R. New York. E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway.

THE CASTAWAYS; A STORY OF ADVENTURES IN THE WILDS OF BORNEO. BY CAPTAIN MAYNE REID. New York. Sheldon & Co., 498 and 500 Broadway.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

form 419